CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

THE AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ OF PĀṆINI

WITH

Translation and Explanatory Notes

By

S. D. JOSHI

AND

J.A.F. ROODBERGEN

VOLUME II

(1.2.1 - 1.2.73)

साहित्य

SAHITYA AKADEMI

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

THE
AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ
OF
PĀṆINI

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

THE AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ OF PĀṆINI

WITH

Translation and Explanatory Notes

BY

S. D. JOSHI

AND

J. A. F. ROODBERGEN

VOLUME II

(1.2.1–1.2.73)

SAHITYA AKADEMI

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini : Translation with explanatory notes in English by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.
Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi (1993) Rs. 160.

© Sahitya Akademi

First Edition 1993

SAHITYA AKADEMI

Head Office :

Rabindra Bhavan, 35, Ferozeshah Road, New Delhi– 110 001.
Sales Office : "Swati", Mandir Marg, New Delhi 110 001.

Regional Offices :

'Jeevan Tara', 23A/44X, Diamond Harbour Road, Calcutta– 700 053.
172, Mumbai Marathi Granth Sangrahalaya Marg, Dadar, Bombay– 400 014.
A. D. A. Rangamandira, 109, J. C. Road, Bangalore– 560 002.
304–305, Anna Salai, Teynampet, Madras 600 018,

Price : Rs. 160

ISBN 81 7201 500 3

Printer :

Vaidika Samshodhana Mandala Mudranalaya
Vedic Research Institute,
T. M. V. Nagar,
Pune– 37 (India)

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge our indebtedness to the authorities of the Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, for accepting our work on Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī as the publication of the Akademi.

We also wish to thank Dr. T. N. Dharmadhikari, Director of the Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala, (Ādarśa Sanskṛta Śodhasaṁsthā) Pune, for assistance at various stages of the work, and Mrs. Nalini Dhadphale, Secretary of the Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala, Pune, for assistance in reading the proofs.

Finally, it is our pleasure to express our thanks to Mr. D. B. Polkam, Deccan College, Pune, for preparing the Indices.

Deccan College
October 30, 1992

S. D. Joshi
J. A. F. Roodbergen

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Translations, books and articles referred to

a. Translations

1. *Pāṇini's Grammatik.* Herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices Versehen von O. Böhtlingk. Leipzig 1887. Nachdruck Hildesheim, 1964.

2. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* Edited and translated into English by the late Śrīśa Chandra Vasu. Allahabad, 1891. Reprint. New Delhi, 1962.

3. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* Roman Transliteration and English Translation by Sumitra M. Katre. Delhi, 1989.

4. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* Volume II. English Translation of *adhyāya* I with Sanskrit text, transliteration, word-boundary, *anuvṛtti*, *vṛtti*, explanatory notes, derivational history of examples, and indices by R. N. Sharma. New Delhi, 1990.

5. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* With Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen. Volume I (1.1.1–1.1.75). Sahitya Akademi : New Delhi, 1991. Referred to as *AP* I.

b. Books

1. V. S. Agrawala, *India as known to Pāṇini.* Second Edition. Varanasi, 1963.

2. W. S. Allen, *Phonetics in Ancient India. London Oriental Series.* Volume 1. Oxford University Press. London, 1953.

3. G. Cardona, *Pāṇini. A Survey of Research.* The Hague–Paris, 1976.

4. S. D. Joshi–S. Bhate, *The Role of the Particle Ca in the Intepretation of the Aṣṭādhyāyī. Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class B, No. 8, University of Poona. Pune, 1983.

5. S. D. Joshi–S. Bhate, *The Fundamental of Anuvṛtti. Publicatons of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class B, No. 9, University of Poona. Pune, 1984

6. P. Kiparsky, *Pāṇini as a Variationist.* Edited by S. D. Joshi. The MIT Press, Cambridge and London. Co-published by Poona Uuiversiy Press. Pune, 1979.

7. A. A. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar. Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research.* Vol I, Part 4. Strassburg : K. J. Trübner, 1910.

8. Patañjali.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(a) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa–Mahābhāṣya, Samarthāhnika* (P. 2.1.1). Edited with Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi.

Puplications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit. Class C, No. 3, University of Poona. Poona, 1968. (*SA*)

(b) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa–Mahābhāṣya, Avyayībhāvatatpuruṣāhnika* (P. 2.1.2–2.1.49). Edited with Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi in collaboration with J. A. F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C, No. 5, University of Poona. Poona, 1969 (*ATA*)

(c) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya, Karmadhārayāhnika* (P.2.1.51-2.1.72). Edited with Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C, No. 6, University of Poona. Poona, 1971. (*KA*)

(d) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa–Mahābhāṣya, Tatpurṣāhnika* (P. 2.2.2–2.2.23). Edited with Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C, No. 7, University of Poona. Poona, 1973. (*TA*)

(e) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa – Mahabhāṣya. Bahuvrīhidvandvāhnika* (P. 2.2.23–2.2.38). Text, Translation and Notes by J. A. F. Roodbergen. Edited by S. D. Joshi. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C. No. 7, University of Poona. Poona, 1974. (*BDA*)

(f) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa–Mahābhāṣya. Kārakāhnika* (P. 1.4.23–1.4.55). Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C, No. 10, University of Poona. Poona, 1975. (*KARA*)

(g) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa–Mahābhāṣya, Vibhaktyāhnika* (P. 2.3.18–2.3.45). Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C, No. 12, University of Poona. Pune, 1980. (*VIBHA*)

(h) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa–Mahābhāṣya, Paspaśāhnika.* Introduction. Text, Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit. Class C, No. 15. University of Poona. Pune, 1984. (*PASPA*)

(i) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa–Mahābhāṣya, Sthānivadbhāvāhnika*, Part I (P. 1.1.56–57). Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune 1990. Referred to as *STHĀNI*, Pt. I.

The ms. of *Sthānivadbhāvāhnika*, Part II (P. 1.1.58–59), was finished in 1989, and is still with the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

9. J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I. Lautlehre. Göttingen : Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1896.

10. J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, Introduction générale par L. Renou. Göttingen : Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957.

11. W. D. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard University Press. Second edition, 1889.

C. Articles

1. G. Cardona, Studies in Indian Grammarians, I : The method of description reflected in the Śivasūtras. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 59.1. Philadelphia, 1969.

2. C. Kunhan Raja, " The Śiva–sūtras of Pāṇini (an analysis) ". *Annals of Oriental Reserach*, University of Madras, Sanskrit Section, Vol. 13, p. 65–81. Madras, 1957.

3. S. D. Joshi–P. Kiparsky, " Siddha and Asiddha in Pāṇinian Phonology ", *Current Approaches in Phonological Theory*. Edited by D. A. Dinnsen. Indiana University Press. Bloomington and London, 1979, p. 223–250.

4. S. D. Joshi. " The Functions *Asiddhatva* and *Sthānivadbhāva* in Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* ", *CASS Studies*, Number 6. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit*. Class E, No. 8. University of Poona. Pune, 1981.

5. S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen, " The Structure of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in Historical Perspective ". *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Studies in the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Edited by S. D. Joshi and S. D. Laddu. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit*. Class E, No. 9. University of Poona. Pune, 1983, p. 59–95.

6. S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen, " On P. 1.1.56 ". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 105, 1985, p. 469–477.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

7. S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen, "On *siddha asiddha* and *sthānivat*". *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.* Vol. LXVIII. Poona, 1987, p. 541–549.

8. S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen, "The rejection of P. 1.1.58 : A confirmation of the exclusively positive aspect of *sthānivadbhāva*". *Annals of the Bhandarkar Orintal Research Institute.* Vol. LXIX. Poona, 1989, p. 217–28.

9. H. Scharfe, Pāṇini's Metalanguage. *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 89. Philadelphia, 1971.

INTRODUCTION

Survey of the subjects dealt with in *adhyāya* 1, *pāda* 2.

As regards its contents, the second *pāda* of the first *adhyāya* is a strange mix of subjects showing no coherence. The subjectwise–division is as follows :

1. P. 1.2.1 – 26 : the *anubandhas Ñ, Ṇ, Ṅ* and *K*
2. P. 1.2.27 – 28 : the quantity of vowels
3. P. 1.2.29 – 31 : pitch
4. P. 1.2.32 – 40 : the *udātta* portion of *svarita*, *ekaśruti*, peculiarities of Vedic recitation during sacrifice
5. P. 1.2.41 : defines *apṛkta*
6. P. 1.2.42 : defines *karmadhāraya*
7. P. 1.2.43 – 44 : define *upasarjana*
8. P. 1.2.45 – 46 : define *prātipadika*
9. P. 1.2.47 – 48 : short vowel substitution
10. P. 1.2.49 – 50 : *luk*–deletion of *taddhita*–suffixes
11. P. 1.2.51 – 52 : *lup*–deletion
12. P. 1.2.53 – 57 : the delimitation of grammar

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

13. P. 1.2.58 – 63 : the use of the plural instead of the singular, and of the singular instead of the dual

14. P. 1.2.64 – 73 : *ekaśeṣa*

Now, out of these rules which can be said to belong with some probability, to Pāṇinian core of the A. ? We assume that the rules represented by nos 4 and 10–14 are out. As for no. 4, these rules really belong to *śrautasūtra* literature. We recall that Kātyāyana to avoid difficulties regarding accentuation proposed to shift the whole sequence P. 1.2.32–40 to the eighth *adhyāya*, after P. 8.4.66. See P. 1.2.32, under 8.

As regards no. 10, a number of inconsistencies was noted. See P. 1.2.49 under 8.

In connection with no. 11 also a number of inconsistencies was noted, See P. 1.2.51, under 10.

As regards no. 12, it was noted that the sequence consists of *vārttika*-like statements, but not coming from Kātyāyana. They contain a criticism of the *luṗ*-deletion technique applied in the *taddhita*-section. They can be viewed as a defence of genuine Pāṇinian word-derivation procedure. See P. 1.2.53, under 13 and 8.

As for no. 13, we note that the rules P. 1.2.58–63 have all of them been rejected by tradition. This, at any rate, makes their Pāṇinian origin doubtful.

In connection with no. 14, we have noted that the *ekaśeṣa*-technique is based on a misconception regarding the function of number-indicating suffixes and that this technique as a whole is alien to Pāṇinian word-derivation procedure. See P. 1.2.64, under 6 and 14b and c.

Thus, out of a total of 73 rules, 39 only can, with some probability, be said to belong to the Pāṇinian core of the *A*.

The *siddha*-principle as presupposed by some *Pāṇinisūtras*

We have been working on the *siddha* theory for the last fifteen years. This theory has been discussed also in our article "On *siddha*, *asiddha* and *sthānivat*" (ABORI, LXVIII, Poona, 1987), but for the benefit of the readers we thought it worthwhile to include this information in the volumes of Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī, because this principle is repeatedly referred to in our notes.

1. Sanskrit grammatical tradition acknowledges five ways of solving a conflict of rules. They are successively *paravipratiṣedha*, which is held to be

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

valid throughout the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*; *pūrvavipratiṣedha*, the notion of which we find first in Kātyāyana[1]; *nityatva*, as defined by *pbs* 42–49; *antaraṅgatva*, as defined by *pb.* 50, and which is held to be valid word-internally also; and *utsargāpavādatva*, as laid down by *pb.* 63. Out of these five, the last two, although accepted in grammar, are not mentioned in the body of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. They are generally accepted conventions holding outside grammar and taken over from there.[2] The application of these conflict– solving principles, especially those of *para*– and *pūrvavipratiṣedha* and of *antaraṅgatva*, has led to a proliferation of exceptions and counterexceptions which justifiably raised doubt about their utility as safeguards of Pāṇini's system.

2. In 1979 S. D. Joshi and P. Kiparski published an article in which they investigated Pāṇini's fundamental ordering relations between rules.[3] They pointed out that Pāṇini used two types of ordering relations which they called *siddha* 'effected' and *asiddha* 'not effected'. A rule A can be *siddha* or *asiddha* with regard to a rule B in the sense that rule A is regarded as having taken effect or as not having taken effect with regard to rule B.[4] A conflict–solving principle was also formulated : a rule which potentially affects the environment of another rule takes priority over it. Or, in other words, first apply environment–changing rules.[5]

3. In an article published in 1987 S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen showed that the ordering releations of *siddha* and *asiddha* also become operative

---

1. Kātyāyana never uses the term *purvavipratiṣedha*. Instead, he usually says *pūrvavipratiṣiddham*. Patañjali renders *pūrvavipratiṣiddham* by means of *pūrvavipratiṣiddhena* plus a 3rd person present act. of *bhu*–, or, less frequently, by simply *pūrvavipratiṣedhena*. The term *pūrvavipratiṣedha* also occurs in some *ślokavārttikas* quoted by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 273, line 25; II, p. 60, line 4; p. 176, line 12). Further details in *STHĀNI*, Part II (unpublished), fn. 473.

2. *Mbh.* I, p. 145, lines 23–28. See S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa–Mahabhāṣya, Sthānivadbhāvāhnika*, Part I. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Poona 1990, *Bh.* No. 79 on P. 1.1.57, and ibid. p. 216.

3. S. D. Joshi and P. Kiparski " *Siddha* and *Asiddha* in Pāṇinian Phonology ", *Current Approaches in Phonological Theory*. Edited by D. A. Dinnsen. Indiana University Press. Bloomington and London, 1979, p. 223–250.

4. Art. quoted, p. 224–225.

5. Art. quoted. p. 233.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

as conflict-solving principles.[6] Then, elaborating the *siddha*-principle, they extended its formulation by adding that that rule is to be applied first which destroys the *nimitta* 'cause of application' of the other, conflicting rule.[7] They also introduced the distinction between a one-way conflict and a two-way conflict.[8] A one-way conflict is assumed, if the application of one of the two conflicting rules renders the application of the other rule impossible, but not the other way round. A two-way conflict is assumed, if the application of the one rule prevents that of the other rule, and vice versa.

What is meant by conflict? Traditionally, a conflict of rules is defined by simultaneity of application: if two rules become simultaneosly applicable, they are said to be in conflict. For purposes of the application of the *siddha*-principle, however, it becomes necessary to redefine the notion of conflict. We will say that two rules A and B are in conflict, if the order of their application—whether A first, or B first—at a given stage of the derivation gives rise to different forms, one of which is desired and one of which is not. We will also speak of a conflict, if one and the same rule, at a given stage of the derivation, becomes applicable to two different linguistic elements.

As an example of a one-way conflict in which the conflicting rules are not simultaneously applicable *dudyūṣati* 'he wishes to gamble' is offered. The derivation starts as follows:

(1) *div-*		*Dhātup.* 4.1
(2) *div* + *saN*		P. 3.2.7
(3) *div* + *sa*	+ *tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(4) *div* + *sa* + *ŚaP*	+ *ti*	P. 3.1.68

In this stage two rules become (simultaneously) applicabls, namely, P. 6.1.9, which prescribes reduplication, and P. 6.4.19, which prescribes the substitution of *ū* for *v*.

If reduplication is applied first, the next stage will be

(5) *div* + *div* + *sa* + *a* + *ti*

6. S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen, "On *siddha*, *asiddha* and *sthānivat*", ABORI, Vol. LXVIII. Poona, 1987, p. 542.

7. Art. quoted, p. 544.

8. Art. p. 542-43.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Here the substitution rule may be applied, which gives us

(6) *div + diū + sa + a + ti*

We note that the substitution rule applies to the oriverbal base only, because it is conditioned by the expression *jhalādau kniti* ' if a *Kit* or *Ṅit* suffix follows which begins with a non-nasal consonant '. The suffix *saN* happens to be such a suffix. Continuing from here we eventually derive the form *didyūṣati*, which is not desired.

If, however, the substitution rule is applied first, the next stage will be

(5) *diū + sa + a + ti*

In this stage two rules become (simultaneously) applicable, namely the reduplication rule and P. 6.1.77, which prescribes *yaṇādeśa*. If the reduplication rule is applied first, the next will be

(6) *di + diū + sa + a + ti*

We note that by P. 6.1.1 the reduplication syllable is to be *ekāc* ' containing one vowel only '. Continuing from here we eventually derive *didyūṣati*, which is not desired.

If, however, the substitution rule (P. 6.1.77) is applied first, the next stage will be

(6) *dyū + sa + a + ti*

Here it is clear that the phonetic form of the linguistic element to which the reduplication rule was to become applicable has changed. Therefore, at this point, when both P. 6.1.9 and P. 6.1.77 become applicable, but when the application of P. 6.1.77 changes the phonetic form of the element to which P. 6.1.9 was to become applicable, the *siddha*-principle tells us to apply P. 6.1.77 first. Thus the next stage will only be

(6) *dyū + sa + a + ti*

In this stage redupliaction becomes applicable, which gives us

(7) *dyū + dyū + sa + a + ti*

Continuing from here we derive the form *dudyūṣati*, which is desired.

The point to be made by this example *dudyūṣati* is that the conflict arises at stage (5) only, when the question is of first applying P. 6.1.9 or P. 6.1.77. These are the two conflicting rules whose priority is to be decided by the *siddha*-principle. It will be seen that the application of P. 6.1.77 is dependent on the earlier application of another substitution rule, namely,

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

P. 6.4.19. The conclusion is that the priority awarded to P. 6.1.77 in stage (6) also determines the priority awarded to P. 6.4.19 in stage (5). We therefore extend the *siddha* principle to mean that in the case of two conflicting rules A and C in which C destroys the *nimitta* of A or changes the phonetic form to which A was to become applicable, a rule B which feeds rule C also takes priority with regard to A.

4. In the example *dudyūṣati* the *siddha*-principle was used to decide a conflict between two rules which both of them belonged to the *siddhakāṇḍa*. One may wonder whether the same principle works, when the question is of two conflicting rules belonging to the *asiddhakāṇḍa*. Let us take the example *bhugna* 'bent'. The example is one of simultaneous application of conflicting rules, and of a one-way conflict. The derivation starts as follows :

(1) *bhuj*–	*Dhātup.* 6.124
(2) *bhuj* + *Kta*	P. 3.2.102

In this stage two rules become simultaneoulsy applicable, namely, P. 8.2.30, which prescribes the sustitution of *g* for *j*, and P. 8.2.45, which prescribes the substitution of *n* for *t*. Suppose we apply P. 8.2.45 first. That gives us

(3) *bhuj* + *na*

In this stage it is not possible to apply P. 8.2.30 any more, because this rule is conditioned by the expression *jhali* 'if (a suffix beginning with) a non-nasal consonant follows'. Consequently, we derive the form *bhujna*, which is not desired. We note that the application first of P. 8.2.45, which is the later rule in Pāṇini's sequential order, has destroyed the *nimitta* of P. 8.2.30.

If, however, P. 8.2.30 is applied first, the next stage will be

(3) *bhug* + *ta*

In this stage it is possible to apply P. 8.2.45. That gives us

(4) *bhug* + *na*

which is the desired form.

What follows from this ? It follows that in the case of two conflicting rules which both of them belong to the *asiddhakāṇḍa* a different principle holds, as might be expected. The principle which holds here is not that the rule which destroys the *nimitta* of the other rule, or which changes the phonetic form to which the other rule was to become applicable is to be applied first, but that the earlier rule in Pāṇini's sequential order is to be applied first. Since

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

this is different from the *siddha*–principle, it may be called the *asiddha*–principle. This conflict–solving *asiddha*–principle is to be distinguished from the rule–ordering *asiddha*–principle as formulated by P. 8.2.1. The same holds, *mutatis mutandis*, for the *siddha*–principle.

It is sometimes thought that in the case of rules belonging to the *asiddhakāṇḍa* the later rule is to be applied first, and its effect to be considered *asiddha* 'not having taken effect'. This opinion, however, creates difficulties in the derivation of forms like *vakti* 'he speaks', and should be discarded. The derivation of *vakti* starts as follows :

(1) *vac–*		*Dhātup.* 2.54
(2) *vac*	+ *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(3) *vac*	+ *tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(4) *vac* + *ŚaP*	+ *ti*	P. 3.1.68
(5) *vac* + °	+ *ti*	P. 2.4.72

In this stage two rules become simultaneously applicable, namely, P. 8.2.30, which prescribes the substitution of *k* for *c*, and P. 8.4.40, which prescribes the substitution of *c* for *t*. Suppose we apply P. 8.4.40 first. That gives us

(6) *vac* + *ci*

In this stage it might be argued that since the *t* → *c* substitution is considered *asiddha* 'not having taken effect' with regard to the earlier rule P. 8.2.30, the position as far as P. 8.2.30 is concerned is still *vac* + *ti*. Here P. 8.2.30 can be applied. But the resulting form will be *vak* + *ci*, which is not desired.

If, however, by the conflict–solving *asiddha* principle we apply the earlier rule in Pāṇini's sequential order first, the result will be

(6) *vak* + *ti*

as is desired. In this stage, the question of applying P. 8.4.40 simply does not arise.

5. Keeping the distinction between a one–way conflict and a two–way conflict in mind, we may group together the conflict–solving principles on this basis, as follows :

A. One–way conflict

(1) *Siddhatva*

(2) *Asiddhatva*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

B. Two-way conflict

(3) *Paravipratiṣedha*, while stipulating that it is restricted to a particular section of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* only.

(4) *Antaraṅgatva*, while stipuleting that it is not valid word-internally, and that the presence of two words is required. The assumption that *antaraṅgatva* holds word-internally also is the root cause of confusion in traditional Sanskrit grammar.

(5) *Utsargāpāvādatva*.

In addition, we note that, whereas the two-way conflict-solving principles deal with the simultaneous application of the conflicting rules, this is not necessarily the case with the one-way conflict-solving principles. Here the conflicting rules may or may not apply simultaneously.

Thus, as compared to the list of the five traditional conflict-solving principles, it will be seen that two have been added, and two have been dropped. The instances of *paravipratiṣedha* outside the *ā kaḍārāt* section and of *pūrvavipratiṣedha* can usually be brought under the control of *utsargāpavādatva*. But this cannot be discussed here. As regards *nityatva*, it may be briefly stated that its function has been taken over by *siddhatva*, which, moreover, has a wider scope. The reason is that *siddhatva* also works in the case of non-simultaneous application of rules.[9]

6. Can it be shown that the application of Pāṇini's rules itself presupposes the working of the *siddha*-principle? To begin with, we offer the example *vivyādha* 'he has pierced'. The derivation starts as follows:

(1)	*vyadh-*	*Dhātup.* 4.72
(2)	*vyadh* + *lIṬ*	P. 3.2.115
(3)	*vyadh* + *tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(4)	*vyadh* + *ṆaL*	P. 3.4.82
(5)	*vyadh* + *vyadh* + *a*	P. 6.1.8

In this stage P. 6.1.17 becomes applicable. which says that *saṃprasāraṇa* takes place in the reduplication of *vyadh-*. We note that this reduplication contains two successive semivowels. Therefore the question is, to which semivowel do we apply *saṃprasāraṇa* first, to the *v* or to the *y*? Moreover, there is rule, P. 6.1.37, which says that after applying *saṃprasāraṇa* to the

9. See the Art. mentioned in fn. 6, p. 544, fn. 8.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

following semivowel in a succession of semivowels, we are not supposed to apply it again to the preceding semivowel.

If *saṃprasāraṇa* is applied first to the second semivowel, the *y*, the resulting form will be *vidh–*. Here P. 6.1.37 prohibits the application of *saṃprasāraṇa* to the originally preceding semivowel, the *v*. We will therefore say that, according to P. 6.1.37, the application of *saṃprasāraṇa* first to the second semivowel destroys the *nimitta* of applying *saṃprasāraṇa* to the first semivowel. We note that in this case the question is not of destroying the *nimitta* of another rule, but of destroying the *nimitta* of a second operation by the same rule. On the other hand, if *saṃprasāraṇa* is first applied to the first semivowel, it can be still applied to the second semivowel. There is no rule which prohibits that. Only, we will derive the wrong form.

So, what we have here is an instance of a one–way conflict. In such a case, the *siddha*–principle tells us to apply that rule–here, that operation–first which destroys the *nimitta* of the other rule–here, the other operation of of the same rule. Accordingly, we will apply *saṃprasāraṇa* first to the second semivowel.

What is the point of all this ? The question is, why does P. 6.1.37 assume that the second semivowel is to be vocalised first ? Tradition has no satisfactory answer. It can only appeal to *sāmarthya*: otherwise P. 6.1.37 would be futile. Our contention is that a satisfactory answer can only be provided, if it is agreed that P. 6.1.37 itself has assumed the working of the *siddha*–principle.

7. A consequence of the *siddha*–principle is that *lopa*–deletion, which evidently affects the phonetic form of the word under derivation, takes precedence over a conflicting rule. But there is also another grammatical device which is closely associated with the *siddha*–principle, be in a different way. That device is *sthānivadbhāva* 'treatment (of the substitute) like the original'.

In fact, the *siddha*–principle has two distinct aims. It serves to prohibit operations based on the *sthānin* 'original'. It also serves to allow operations based on the *ādeśa* 'substitute'.[10] The technical expressions are *utsargalakṣaṇapratiṣedha* and *ādeśalakṣaṇabhāva* respectively. This follows directly

10. S. D. Joshi, "The Functions of *Asiddhatva* and *Sthānivadbhāva* in Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*". *CASS Studies* No. 6. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class E, No. 8, University of Poona, 1982, p. 167.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

from the two aims attributed by Kātyāyana to *asiddhatva* as a rule-ordering principle.[11]

It is for these reasons that from the point of view of the *siddha*-principle the sequence P. 1.1.56-63 has special interest. The contents of these rules may be indicated as follows :

1. P. 1.1.56 defines *sthānivadbhāva*.

2. P. 1.1.57 counters the effect of the *siddha*-principle in the context of *sthānivadbhāva*. This can be shown with the help of the two *mūrdhābiṣikta* 'time-hallowed' examples of this rule, namely, *paṭvyā* 'by the clever one (fem.)' and *mṛdvyā* 'by the soft one (fem.)'.[12]

3. P. 1.1.58 is a later insertion.[13]

4. P. 1.1.59 counters the effect of the *siddha*-principle in the case of reduplication.

5. P. 1.1.60 and 61 are *saṃjñā*-rules required for the understanding of P. 1.1.62 and 63.

6. P. 1.1.62 counters the effect of the *siddha*-principle in the case of deletion (*lopa*) of suffixes.

7. P. 1.1.63 re-enforces the *siddha*-principle in the case of *lu*-deletion of suffixes.

From this brief description it will be clear that, apart from *asiddhatva* as a conflict-solving principle, Pāṇini knows at least two other devices which counter the effect of the *siddha*-principle, namely, *sthānivadbhāva* (P. 1.1.57 and 59) and *pratyayalakṣaṇatā* (P. 1.1.62). This is what will be shown in the sequel, with the help of the proper examples.

8. The example *paṭvyā* for P. 1.1.57 is derived as follows :

(1) *paṭu* + *ṄīṢ* P. 1.4.44

(2) *paṭu* + *ī* + *Ṭā* P. 4.1.2

---

11. Art. quoted, p. 154.

12. *Mbh.* I, p. 144, lines 7-10. See *STHĀNI*, Part 1, p. 190 *Bh.* No. 49 on P. 1.1.57.

13. S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen, "The rejection of P. 1.1.58 : A confirmation of the exclusively positive aspect of *sthānivadbhāva*". *ABORI*, Vol. LXIX, Poona, 1988, p. 217-228.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(3)	*paṭu* + *y* + *ā*	P. 6.1.77
(4)	*paṭv* + *y* + *ā*	P. 6.1.77
	paṭvyā.	

In stage (3) the *nimitta* of P. 6.1.77 by which *y* is substituted for *ī* is the following *ā*. The substitute *y* can only become the *nimitta* of the subsequent application of P. 6.1.77 for the desired substitution of *v* for *u*, if the *y* is treated like the original *ī*.

The point to be made is that in stage (3) one and the same rule, P. 6.1.77, becomes applicable to two different linguistic elements, the *u* and the *ī*. Here, if we apply the substitution rule first to the *ī*, we cannot apply it any more to the *u*. On the other hand, if we first apply the substitution rule to the *u*, we can still apply it to the *ī*. Therefore, what we have here is a one-way conflict. In such a case, the *siddha* principle tells us to apply that rule first which destroys the *nimitta* of the other rule. In the present case we will take this to mean that P. 6.1.77 is to be applied to that element first which will destroy the *nimitta* of the application of P. 6.1.77 to the other element. Accordingly, we first apply P. 6.1.77 to the *ī*. But this would lead us to derive the form *paṭuyā*, which is not desired. Therefore, to counter the effect of the *siddha*-principle here, Pāṇini has introduced the device of *sthānivadbhāva*. It enables us to transfer the phonemic property of the original vowel *ī* to the substitute *y*. Thereby it opens up the way for the second application of P. 6.1.77. Thereby it opens up the way for the second application of P. 6.1.77, this time to the *u*. That is how we derive the desired form *paṭvyā*.

Tradition, that is, Patañjali rejects *paṭvyā* and *mṛdvyā* as the proper examples for P. 1.1.57, and assumes that they can be taken care of by means of the *antaraṅga-pb*, which is applied word-internally.[14]

One of the four crucial examples for P. 1.1.59 is *cakratus* 'the two of them have made'. It is derived as follows:

(1)	*kṛ-*	*Dhātup.* 8.10
(2)	*kṛ* + *lIṬ*	P. 3.2.115
(3)	*kṛ* + *thas*	P. 3.4.78
(4)	*kṛ* + *atus*	P. 3.4.82
(5)	*kṛ* + *atus*	P. 6.1.77
(6)	*kṛ* + *kṛ* + *atus*	P. 6.1.8; 1.1.59
(7)	*kṛ* + *kr* + *atus*	P. 6.1.77

14. See *STHĀNI*, Part I, Note (123).

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(8)	*ka* + *kr* + *atus*	P. 7.4.66
(9)	*kar* + *kr* + *atus*	P. 1.1.51
(10)	*ka°* + *kr* + *atus*	P. 7.4.60
(11)	*ca* + *kr* + *atus*	P. 7.4.62
	cakratus.	

In stage (4) two rules become simultaneously applicable, namely, the reduplication rule P. 6.1.8 and the substitution rule P. 6.1.77. After the application of the substitution rule we cannot apply the reduplication rule any more, because, by P. 6.1.1, a reduplication must be *ekāc* 'containing one single vowel', and that vowel is lacking now due to the application of P. 6.1.77. Nor can we have recourse to P. 1.1.57 in order to restore the original quality of the verbal base vowel, because this rule only applies when the question is of applying an opereation to an element immediately preceding the substitute. But there is no such preceding element here.

Since the application first of the substitution rule changes the phonetic form to which the reduplication rule was to become applicable, the *siddha*-principle tells us to apply that rule first. The result is stage (5). But now we can only have the desired form of the reduplication, if the substitute *r* of the verbal base is treated like the original vowel *ṛ*. This is precisely what Pāṇini renders possible by prescribing *sthānivadbhāva* in the context of reduplication, by P. 1.1.59. Accordingly, we derive stage (6). But here P. 6.1.77 becomes applicable again, which gives us stage (7). Continuing from here we have no difficulty in deriving the desired form.

One of the three examples mentioned by the *KV* for P. 1.1.62 is *adhok* 'he milked'. The desrivation starts as follows :

(1)	*duh–*	*Dhātup.* 2.4
(2)	*duh* + *laṄ*	P. 3.2.111
(3)	*a* + *duh* + *laṄ*	P. 6.4.71
(4)	*a* + *duh* + *tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(5)	*a* + *duh* + *ŚaP* + *ti*	P. 3.1.68
(6)	*a* + *duh* + *a* + *t*	P. 3.4.100
(7)	*a* + *duh* + ° + *t*	P. 2.4.72

In this stage two rules become applicable simultaneously, namely, P. 7.3.86, which prescribes *guṇa*, and P. 6.1.68, which prescribes delection (*lopa*) of the finite verb ending *t*. The application of the *lopa*-rule first destroys the *nimitta* of the *guṇa*-rule, bacause once the finite verb ending has been deleted, there is no *sārvadhātuka* suffix any more, and, consequently, the

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

condition for applying *guṇa* is lacking, On the other hand, if we apply the *guṇa*–rule first, we can still apply the *lopa*–rule. Therefore, this is an instance of a one–way conflict. In such a case, the *siddha*–principle tells us to apply that rule first which destroys the *nimitta* of the other rule. That gives us

(8) *a* + *duh* + °

Unfortunately, we cannot now derive the desired form, because that requires the application of *guṇa*. It is precisely this which is rendered possible by Pāṇini by means of P. 1.1.62. This rule tells us that even if a suffix has been deleted, any operations based on that suffix may go ahead. Therefore we continue

(9) *a* + *doh* P. 7.3.86

Continuing from here, we have no difficulty in deriving the desired form.

For tradition, like in the case of the other examples *agnicit* 'one who has built up the sacrificial fire' and *somasut* 'one who presses the soma', the only purpose of P. 1.1.62 as shown by the examples is that the name *pada* (by P. 1.4.14) remains applicable after the finite verb ending or the case–ending has been deleted. But if this is all, one may wonder why the examples *agnicit*, *somasut* and *adhok* have been selected, when more easily understood examples are easily available. Moreover, it cannot be the purpose of P. 1.1.62 to make the designation *pada* available. Patañjali also realizes that. The fact is the properties *tiñantatva* 'ending in a finite verb ending' and *subantatva* 'ending in a case ending' are properties of linguistic items. Therefore *sthānivadbhāva* becomes applicable, and that is how we can have the designation *pada*.

Apparently, while still preserving the examples, *agnicit*, *somasut* and *adhok*, tradition has lost the sense of the purpose of these examples in connection with P. 1.1.62. But the fact that these examples have been preserved shows the existence of a grammatical tradition more true to the spirit of Pāṇini than the tradition which has come to us via Kātyāyana and Patañjali. Amazingly, this tradition has been preserved by the authors of the *KV*.

8. Another example to show that P. 1.1.62 presupposes the *siddha*–principle is *asau* 'that/he'. It is derived as follows :

(1) *adas* + *sU* P. 4.1.2
(2) *adaau* + ° P. 7.2.107 (compare *SK* No. 437 on P. 7.2.107)
(3) *adau* P. 6.1.88
(4) *asau* P. 7.2.106
asau.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The question is, why does Pāṇini say *sulopaś ca* 'and also deletion (*lopa*) of *sU*' in P. 7.2.107 ? It might be argued that we could have this deletion by P. 6.1.68 already. Here the following considerations are offered. In stage (1) two rules become simultaneously applicable, namely, P. 6.1.68, which prescribes deletion (*lopa*) of *sU* after a stem ending in a consonant, and P. 7.2.107. For purposes of the argument we will divide the latter rule as P. 7.2.107 (a) *adasa au*, and P. 7.2.107 (b) *sulopaś ca*.

If we apply P. 6.1.68 first, we can still apply P. 7.2.107 (a) and derive the desired form. But then, why has P. 7.2.107 (b) been phrased ? On the other hand, if P. 7.2.107 (a) is applied first, it will destroy the *nimitta* of P. 6.1.68, because this latter rule only applies, if the last sound of the preceding *aṅga* is a consonant. Therefore what we have here is a one-way conflict. Now the *siddha*-principle tells us to apply that rule first which destroys the *nimitta* of the other rule. Accordingly, we apply P. 7.2.107 (a). But the consequence is that now we cannot account for the *lopa* of *sU*, which is required. To remove this difficulty, a special provision must be made. This provision is precisely P. 7.2.107 (b) Or, in other words, P. 7.2.107, as we have it, presuposes the working of the *siddha*-principle.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ

1. Adhyāya 1

1.2. Pāda 2

1.2.1 GĀṄKUṬĀDIBHYO 'ÑṆIN ṄIT ' (when added) after (the substitute verbal base) *gāṄ* or after (the verbal bases included in the group) beginning with *kuṭ*– " to become crooked " (suffixes which are) not marked with *Ñ* or *Ṇ* (are regarded as) marked with *Ṅ* '.

1. According to tradition as represented by the *KV*, the present rule is an *atideśasūtra*. For what is meant by *atidesa* see *ATA*, fn. 1. The idea is that suffixes which actually are not provided with the *anubandha Ṅ* will be treated like having been provided with *Ṅ* on the condition or conditions stated.

2. The word *pratyaya* ' suffix ', which is not used in the rule, is supplied, because what comes after *gāṄ* and *kuṭādi* can only be a *pratyaya*. See P. 3.1.91 and P. 3.1.1–2.

3. Terms used in the nominative in Pāṇini's rules represent either the topic (*uddeśya*) or the predicate (*vidheya*). In the present rule the portion *gāṅkuṭādibhyo 'ñṇin* represents the *uddeśya*, whereas *ṅit* represents the *vidheya*.

4. Grammar knows two verbal bases *gāṄ*. One is introduced as a substitute for *iṄ*– ' to go ' in particular tenses (P. 2.4.49–50), whereas the other is mentioned as *gāṄ gatau* in the *Dhātupāṭha* (1.998). As stated by the *KV*, the *gāṄ* meant by P. 1.2.1 is the substitute base only. This is clear from the use of the marker *Ṅ* whose only purpose here is to show that the *anubandha Ṅ* of *gā* has no other purpose (like *ātmanepada*) than its inclusion in the present rule only. The marker *Ṅ* may be indicative of the addition of *ātmanepada* endings (by P. 3.1.12). But in the case of *gāṄ* replacing the verbal base *iṄ*– we can have the *ātmanepada* endings simply by *sthānivadbhāva*. In the case of *gāṄ gatau* the *Ṅ* may have been meant for adding *ātmanepada* endings. But whether this verbal base was known to Pāṇini is questionable.

5. The *kuṭādi*–group is a subgroup of the bases belonging to the sixth conjugation (*Dhātup.* 6.73–115).

6. One of the examples for *gāṄ* quoted by the *KV* is *adhyagīṣṭa* ' he recited (by heart) '. The derivation is as follows :

(1) *adhi*	+ *iṄ*–			*Dhātup.* 2.37
(2) *adhi*	+ *i*		+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.2.110

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

In this stage, two rules become simultaneously applicable, namely, P. 2.4.50, which presribes the substitution of *gāṄ* for *iṄ* as a less preferred option in the aorist, and P. 6.4.72, which prescribes the augment *ā* for a verbal base beginning with a vowel. If we first apply the substitution-rule, we cannot apply the augment-rule, because there is no longer a verbal base beginning with a vowel. However, if we first apply the augment-rule, we can still apply substitution-rule. Therefore this is an instance of a one-way conflict, for which see Joshi-Roodbergen, 1987, p. 542-3. In such a case, the *siddha*-principle tells us to apply that rule first which destroys the *nimitta* 'cause of application' of the other rule. That gives us

(3) *adhi*	+ *gāṄ*- + *lUṄ*	P. 2.4.50

Then we continue

(4) *adhi* + *a* + *gā*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 6.4.71
(5) *adhi* + *a* + *gā* + *cli*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.1.43
(6) *adhi* + *a* + *gā* + *sIC*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.1.44
(7) *adhi* + *a* + *gā* + *s*	+ *ta*	P. 3.4.78
(8) *adhi* + *a* + *gī* + *s*	+ *ta*	P. 6.4.66
(9) *adhy* + *a* + *gī* + *s*	+ *ta*	P. 6.1.77
(10) *adhy* + *a* + *gī* + *ṣ*	+ *ta*	P. 8.3.57
(11) *adhy* + *a* + *gī* + *ṣ*	+ *ṭa*	P. 8.4.41
adhyagīṣṭa.		

The point is that in stage (8) the application of P. 6.4.66 is conditioned by P. 6.4.46, *ārdhadhātuke*, by P. 6.4.63, *kniti*, and by the term *hali* in the rule itself. The *ārdhadhātuka* suffix concerned is *sIC*. This suffix is neither *Ñit* not *Ṇit*. But when added to *gāṄ*, it is considered *Ṅit*. That is why P. 6.4.66 can become applicable.

7. The form *adhyagīṣṭhāḥ* is attested in the *Chāndogya Up.*, 7.1.3.

1.2.2 VIJA IṬ '(when added) after (the verbal base) *vij*- "to shudder" (a suffix beginning with the augment) *iṬ* (is regarded as marked with *Ṅ*)'.

1. Like the preceding *sūtra* this is an *atideśasūtra*.

2. The word *vijas* is the sg. abl. of *vij* taken as a consonant stem. The function of the abl. here has been defined by P. 1.1.67.

3. The word *iṬ* is interpreted to mean *iḍādir yasya sa pratyayaḥ* 'that suffix which begins with *iṬ*'. The reason for this interpretation is simply that an augment cannot stand by itself. Clearly *pb.* 33 is not applicable here, because that requires a speechsound being mentioned in the locative. The

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

term *iṭ* does not refer to a mere speechsound, nor has it been mentioned in the locative.

4. The *uddeśya* is *vija iṭ*. By the introduction of a new *uddeśya* the earlier topic is discontinued. See Joshi– Bhate, 1984 p. 271, convention 4. The *vidheya ṅit* is continued from P. 1.2.1.

5. The verbel base *vij–* is mentioned in the *Dhātup.* 6.9 as *Ovijī*. Here the marker *O* indicates that in the *niṣṭhā–* forms *n* is substituted for *t* (P. 8.2.45), whereas the marker *ī* indicates that before the suffixes called *niṣṭhā* the augment *iṬ* is not added (P. 7.2.14).

6. Since a suffix before which the augment *iṬ* is added is regarded as *Ṅit*, *guṇa* which becomes applicable to the verbal base vowel by P. 7.3.86, is prohibited by P. 1.1.5.

7. An example quoted by the *KV* is *udvijitā* 'one who shudders', or 'he shall shudder'. The derivations are as follows :

A.	(1)	*OvijĪ–*	*Dhātup.* 6.9
	(2)	*ud + vij*	
	(3)	*ud + vij + tṛC*	P. 3.1.133
	(4)	*ud + vij + iṬ + tṛ*	P. 7.2.35

In this stage, *guṇa* becomes applicable to the verbal base vowel, by P. 7.3.86. It is prohibited by P. 1.2.2 in combination with P. 1.1.5.

(5)	*ud + vij + i + tṛ + sU*	P. 4.1.2
(6)	*ud + vij + i + tanaṄ + s*	P. 7.1.94
(7)	*ud + vij + i + tan + °*	P. 6.1.68
(8)	*ud + vij + i + tān*	P. 6.4.11
(9)	*ud + vij + i + tā*	P. 8.2.7
	udvijitā.	

B.	(1)	*OvijĪ–*	*Dhātup.* 6.9
	(2)	*ud + vij*	
	(3)	*ud + vij + lUṬ*	P. 3.3.15
	(4)	*ud + vij + tiP*	P. 3.4.78
	(5)	*ud + vij + Ḍā*	P. 2.4.85
	(6)	*ud + vij + tāsī + ā*	P. 3.1.33
	(7)	*ud + vij + iṬ + tās° + ā*	P. 7.2.35

In this stage, *guṇa* becomes applicable to the verbal base vowel, by P. 7.3.86. It is prohibited by P. 1.2.2 in combination with P. 1.1.5.

(8)	*ud + vij + i + t° + ā*	P. 6.4.143
	udvijitā.	

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.2.3 VIBHĀṢORṆOḤ '(when added) after (the verbal base) *ūrṇu* "to cover" (a suffix beginning with the augment *iṬ* is regarded as marked with *Ṅ*) as the less preferred option'.

1. Like the preceding *sūtras* this is an *atideśasūtra*.

2. The word *ūrṇoḥ* is the sg. abl. of *ūrṇu*, that is, the form in which the verbal base is mentioned in the *dhātupāṭha* as stripped of its marker *Ñ* (*Dhātup*. 2.30).

3. By means of the word *vibhāṣā* Pāṇini registers a stylistic preference among variant forms. In fact, *vibhāṣā* is used to indicate the less preferred option. See Kiparski 1979, p. 1.

4. The mention of *ūrṇoḥ* cancels that of *vijaḥ* from the previous rule. The words *iṬ* and *Ṅit* are continued from P. 1.2.2 and P. 1.2.1 respectively.

5. The *uddeśya* is *vibhāṣā ūrṇoḥ iṭ*. The *vidheya* is *ṅit*.

6. The purpose of the rule is to prevent *guṇa* of the second vowel of the verbal stem, applicable by P. 7.3.84.

7. The present rule says *vibhāṣorṇoḥ*. This may be contrasted with P. 7.2.6 and P. 7.3.90, which have been phrased as *ūrṇoter vibhāṣā*. Presumably the two different phrasings are mere stylistic differences.

8. Since the rule states an option, forms like *prorṇuvitā* 'one who coveres/he will cover' and *prorṇavitā* (same meanings) are both allowed. But *prorṇuvitā* is the less preferred option. Here the prohibition of *guṇa* (applicable by P. 7.3.84) for the final verbal base vowel leads to its replacement by *uv*, by P. 6.4.77. On the other hand, the application of *guṇa* by P. 7.3.84 leads to replacement by *o*, and then by *av*, by P. 6.1.78. Unfortunately, the two forms are not attested in prepāṇinian literature.

We do, however, find the forms *prorṇuvīta* (*Kāṭhaka Saṃh*. 26.9; 40.4) and *prorṇuvīmi* (*Suparṇādhyāya* 11.4), apparently optative forms representing the less preferred option.

1.2.4 SĀRVADHĀTUKAM APIT 'a *sārvadhātuka* (suffix) which is not marked with *P* (is regarded as marked with *Ṅ*)'.

1. Like the preceding *sūtras* this is an *atideśasūtra*.

2. The suffixes called *sārvadhātuka* are defined by P. 3.4.113. All finite verb endings and all elements marked with *Ś* are called *sārvadhātuka*. All other suffixes are called *ārdhadhātuka*, by P. 3.4.114.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

3. Among the *parasmaipada* finite verb endings three only are marked with *P*, namely, *tiP*, *siP* and *miP*. The *ātmanepada* verb endings are (all of them) *apit*.

4. The *uddeśya* is *sārvadhātukam apit*. By the introduction of a new *uddeśya* the earlier topic is discontinued. See Joshi– Bhate, 1984, p. 271, convention 4. The *vidheya ṅit* is continued from P. 1.2.1.

5. Why doesn't P. 1.2.4 form one single rule with P. 1.2.3 ? If it were so, P. 1.2.4 would have been restricted to the one example of *ūrṇu*. But this goes against Patañjali's statement *naikaṃ prayojanaṃ yogārambhaṃ prayojayati* ' one single example does not prompt the phrasing of a rule ' (*Mbh*. I, p. 68, line 16). Clearly, P. 1.2.4 has a wide field of application.

6. In his *Bhāṣya* on P. 3.1.83 (*Mbh*. II, p. 64, lines 8–10) Patañjali says *tasmād vaktavyaṃ pin na ṅid bhavatīti ṅic ca na pid bhavatīti. Na vaktavyam. Evaṃ vakṣyāmi. Sārvadhātukaṃ ṅid bhavati pin na* ' therefore the statement " *Pit* is not *Ṅit* and *Ṅit* is not *Pit* " should be phrased. It need not be phrased. I will phrase (it) like this: " a *sārvadhātuka* is *Ṅit*, (but) a *Pit* (*sārvadhātuka*) is not (*Ṅit*) " '.

7. The statement that a *sārvadhātuka* suffix which is not marked with *P* is regarded as *Ṅit* and therefore blocks *guṇa*, by P. 1.1.5, commands a wide field of application, as stated. The *guṇa*–operations blocked are especially those prescribed by P. 7.3.84 (for the *iK*–vowel of a stem–forming suffix) and P. 7.3.86 (for the prefinal verbal base vowel).

Some examples:

(1) Conjugation class I: *bhavati*, *bhavatas*, *bhavanti*. Here the *vikaraṇa* is *ŚaP*. Since it is *Pit*, it allows *guṇa* of the preceding verbal base vowel by P. 7.3.84. The question of applying *guṇa* to the vowel of the *vikaraṇa* does not arise, because this is not an *iK*–vowel. To derive the 3rd pl. we apply P. 7.1.3 and P. 6.1.97.

(2) Conjugation class II: *dveṣṭi*, *dviṣṭas*, *dviṣanti*. Here the *vikaraṇa* is *ŚaP*. It is *luk*–deleted by P. 2.4.72. Since it is *luk*–deleted, P. 1.1.62 cannot become applicable, according to P. 1.1.63. Therefore, from the stage *dviṣ* + *tiP*, since *guṇa* by P. 7.3.86 is not prohibited, we derive *dveṣ* + *ti*. Thereafter we apply P. 8.3.57 and P. 8.4.40. On the other hand, the du. and pl. endings are *apit*. Therefore they are declared *ṅit*, and the *guṇa* operation by P. 7.3.86 is blocked by P. 1.1.5.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(3) Conjugation class III: *juhoti, juhutas, juhvati.* Here the *vikaraṇa* is *ŚaP.* Since it is *ślu*–deleted by P. 2.4.75, P. 1.1.62 cannot become applicable, according to P. 1.1.63. Therefore, from the stage *hu* + *tiP* we proceed to *hu* + *hu* + *tiP* by P. 6.1.10. Here *guṇa* for the verbal base vowel is not prohibited, because the finite verb ending is *Pit.* However, by the application of *guṇa* to the vowel of the reduplication by P. 7.3.84 we derive *juhoti.* But the endings *tas* and *jhi* are *apit.* Therefore they are regarded as *Ṅit.* This being so, P. 1.1.5 blocks the *guṇa*–operation prescribed by P. 7.3.84. To derive the 3rd pl. we apply P. 6.4.87 and P. 7.1.4.

(4) Conjugation class IV: *yudhyate, yudhyete, yudhyante.* Here the *vikaraṇa* is *ŚyaN* (P. 3.1.69). Since *ŚyaN* is *apit,* and is therefore regarded as *Ṅit,* the application of *guṇa* to the verbal base vowel by P. 7.3.86 is blocked by P. 1.1.5. The question of applying *guṇa* to the vowel of the *vikaraṇa* does not arise, because *ŚyaN* has no *iK*–vowel, and, moreover, the *ātmanepada* endings are *apit* anyway.

(5) Conjugation class V: *cinoti, cinutas, cinvanti.* Here the *vikaraṇa* is *Śnu* (P. 3.1.73). Since *Śnu* is *apit,* and is therefore regarded as *Ṅit,* the application of *guṇa* to the verbal base vowel by P. 7.3.84 is blocked by P. 1.1.5. But since *tiP* is *Pit,* the *guṇa*–operation on the *iK*–vowel of the *vikaraṇa* by P. 7.3.84 is allowed. That gives us *ci* + *no* + *ti.* But since the 3rd du. and pl. endings are *apit,* and therefore regarded as *Ṅit,* the *guṇa*–operation on the *iK*–vowel of the *vikaraṇa* by P. 7.3.84 is blocked by P. 1.1.5.

(6) Conjugation class VI: *tudati, tudatas, tudanti.* Here the *vikaraṇa* is *Śa* (P. 3.1.77). Since *Śa* is *apit,* and is therefore regarded as *Ṅit,* the application of *guṇa* to the verbal base vowel by P. 7.3.86 is blocked by P. 1.1.5. The question of applying *guṇa* to the vowel of the *vikaraṇa* does not arise, because this is not an *iK*–vowel.

(7) Conjugation class VII: *ruṇaddhi, runddhas, rundhanti.* Here the *vikaraṇa* is *ŚnaM* (P. 3.1.78). In this case the application of P. 1.2.4 is not required, because the verbal base portion *ru* is no more the *aṅga* with regard to the inserted *vikaraṇa ŚnaM.*

One may wonder why the *anubandha Ś* has been added in *ŚnaM.* The answer will be stated when we come to the *aṅga*–section.

The form *ruṇaddhi* is derived as follows :

(1) *rudh*–		*Dhātup.* 7.1
(2) *rudh*	+ *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(3) *rudh*	+ *tiP*	P. 3.4.78

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(4)	*ru–ŚnaM–dh + ti*	P. 3.1.78; 1.1.47
(5)	*ru na dh + dhi*	P. 8.2.40
(6)	*ru ṇa dh + dhi*	P. 8.3.57
(7)	*ru ṇa d + dhi*	P. 8.4.53
	ruṇaddhi.	

To derive the 3rd du. and pl. forms we apply P. 6.4.111.

(8) Conjugation class VIII: *karoti, kurutas, kurvanti.* Here the *vikaraṇa* is the *ārdhadhātuka* suffix *u*. Being an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix, *u* allows *guṇa*. Therefore, from the stage *kṛ+u+tiP* we derive *kar+u+tiP*, by P. 7.3.84 and P. 1.1.51. The finite verb ending *tiP* is *Pit* and therefore allows *guṇa* for the preceding *u*, by P. 7.3.84. That gives us *kar + o + ti*. But the 3rd du. and pl. endings being *apit* are considered *Ṅit*. Therefore *guṇa* by P. 7.3.84 for the preceding *u* is not allowed. As in the case of *karoti*, the *ārdhadhātuka* suffix allows *guṇa* for the verbal base vowel. That gives us *kar + u + tas/jhi*. Here P. 6.4.110 becomes applicable. That gives us *kur + u + tas/jhi*.

(9) Conjugation class IX: *krīṇāti, krīṇītas, krīṇanti.* Here the *vikaraṇa* is *Śnā* (P. 3.1.80). Since *Śnā* is *apit*, and is therefore regarded as *Ṅit*, the application of *guṇa* to the verbal base vowel by P. 7.3.84 is blocked by P. 1.1.5. The question of applying *guṇa* to the vowel of the *vikaraṇa* does not arise because this is not an *iK*–vowel. On the other hand, the endings of the 3rd du. and pl. are *apit sārvadhātuka* suffixes. Therefore they are regarded as *Ṅit*. Therefore P. 6.4.113 and P. 6.4.112 become applicable respectively.

P. 6.4.113 prescribes the substitution of long *ī* for the *ā* of the *vikaraṇa* That gives us *krī + nī + tas*, from which we derive *krī + ṇī + tas*, by P. 8.4.2. The other rule, P. 6.4.112, prescribes *lopa* of the *ā* of the *vikaraṇa* before a *ṅit sārvadhātuka* suffix which begins with a vowel. That gives us *krī + n + anti*, from which we derive *krī + ṇ + anti*, P. 8.4.2.

(10) Conjugation class X: *corayati, corayatas, corayanti.* Both *ṄiC* (P. 3.1.25), which is an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix, and the general *vikaraṇa ŚaP* (P. 3.1.68), which is a *Pit sārvadhātuka* suffix and therefore not treated like *Ṅit*, allow *guṇa*. The *guṇa* for the prefinal vowel of the verbal base is applied by P. 7.3.86. The *guṇa* for the *iK*–vowel of *ṄiC* is applied by P. 7.3.84. Subsequently P. 6.1.78 is applied. The question of applying *guṇa* by P. 7.3.84 to *ŚaP* does not arise, because of the absence of an *iK*–vowel.

1.2.5 ASAṂYOGĀL LIṬ KIT '(The perfect endings replacing the perfect marker) *lIṬ* (which are not marked with *P* and which are) added after (a

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

verbal base) not ending in a conjunct consonant (are regarded as) marked with *K* '.

1. Like the preceding *sūtras* this is an *atideśasūtra*. For all practical purposes *apit lIṬ* endings like *atus* and *us* become *Katus* and *Kus*, much like the *niṣṭhā* suffixes *Kta* and *KṭavatU*. However, the latter forms have an *aupadeśika kittva*, that is, they have been provided with the *anubandha K* as part of Pāṇini's *upadeśa*. This is not so in the case of *atus* and *us*. Tradition expresses this by saying that the *apit lIṬ* endings meant here are regarded or treated as having the *anubandha K* which, in Pāṇini's *upadeśa*, they don't have.

2. The word *apit* is continued from P. 2.1.4, because there is nothing to cancel it. The word *sārvadhātukam* from P. 1.2.4 is cancelled, because the *lIṬ* endings are *ārdhadhātuka* by P. 3.4.115. The word *Ṅit* from P. 1.2.1 is discontinued, because it is cancelled by the incompatible item *Kit*, see Joshi–Bhate, 1984, p. 271, convention 3.

3. The term *asaṃyogāt* functions as the qualifier of the implied word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base'. Therefore the *KV* interprets *asaṃyogāt* as *asaṃyogāntāt* 'after (a varbal base) not ending in a conjunct consonant' by P. 1.1.72. The word *dhātoḥ* is implied on the basis of *sāmarthya* 'a matter of course', because *lIṬ* endings are prescribed after a verbal base only.

4. Since the *lIṬ* endings are substitutes of the endings prescribed by P. 3.4.78, they share in the distinction of *Pit* and *apit* by *sthānivadbhāva* (P. 1.1.56).

5. The *uddeśya* is *asaṃyogāl liḍ apit*. The *vidheya* is *kit*.

6. Why this change–over from *Ṅit* to *Kit*, since both *anubandhas N* and *K* prohibit *guṇavṛddhī* ? The reason is that, in addition, the *anubandha K* has other functions. It has been mentioned as a condition for *saṃprasāraṇa* in connection with certain verbs by P. 6.1.15. Therefore wherever these other functions come into play also, it appears to be more economical to shift from *Ṅit* to *Kit*. Consider the form *ūcatus* 'the two of them have said'. It is derived as follows :

(1) *vac–*	*Dhātup.* 2.54
(2) *vac* + *lIṬ*	P. 3.2.115
(3) *vac* + *tas*	P. 3.4.78
(4) *vac* + *atus*	P. 3.4.82

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

In this stage two rules become applicable simultaneously, namely, P. 6.1.8, which prescribes reduplication, and P. 6.1.15, which prescribes *saṃprasāraṇa*. This is not a case of conflict, because after the application of the one rule the other still remains applicable. But the question is, which of the two rules do we apply first? Here the *siddha*–principle as a rule–ordering device, that is, a device deciding the order of application, tells us to apply that rule first which changes the phonetic form to which the other rule was to become applicable. Accordingly, we apply the *saṃprasāraṇa* rule first. That gives us :

(5)	*uc* + *atus*	P. 6.1.15; 6.1.108

From here we continue

(6)	*uc* + *uc* + *atus*	P. 6.1.8
(7)	*u°* + *uc* + *atus*	P. 7.4.60
(8)	*ūc* + *atus*	P. 6.1.101
	ūcatus.	

7. One of the counterexamples provided by the *KV* is *sasraṃsa* 'he has fallen down'. Since *sraṃs*– ends in a conjunct consonant, the *lIṬ* ending –*e* is not *Kit*. That is why the *n* of *sraṃs*– is not deleted by P. 6.4.24.

8. According to *Vt.* I, on the present rule, in the case of verbal bases having a prefinal *ṛ*, when P. 2.1.5 prohibits *guṇa* in connection with *lIṬ* endings, and when P. 7.3.86 prescribes *guṇa* of the prefinal verbal base vowel before an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix, the earlier rule should prevail by (*pūrva*) *vipratiṣedha*. Subsequently, Kātyāyana rejects this *Vt.* by saying that a statement regarding this matter has already been made. Reference is to *Vt.* II on P. 3.1.45, which says that *guṇa* (by P. 7.3.86) is prevented, because P. 2.1.5 would be left *anavakāśa* 'without scope (of application)', if *guṇa* were allowed. The idea is that wherever P. 2.1.5 becomes applicable *guṇavṛddhī* is applicable by P. 7.3.86. The latter rule, being the *para*–rule according to tradition, will prevail, so P. 2.1.5 would be left without examples. But this cannot be. That is why P. 2.1.5 is assumed to override P. 7.3.86, on the basis of *anavakāśatva*.

The problem raised by tradition, whether P. 2.1.5 should be applied first, or P. 7.3.86, is artificial. When Pāṇini declares an element to be *Ñit* or *Kit*, this has immediate effect. *Anubandhas* belong to Pāṇini's *upadeśa*, whereas

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

prescriptions of *guṇa* etc. do not. Therefore the prescription of *guṇa* by P. 7.3.86 is effectively blocked by P. 2.1.5.

1.2.6 INDHIBHAVATIBHYĀṂ CA 'also (the perfect endings replacing the perfect marker *lIṬ* which are added after the verbal bases) *indhI*– " to kindle " and *bhū*– " to become " (are regarded as marked with *K*) '.

1. Like the preceding *sūtras* this is an *atideśasūtra*.

2. The words *lIṬ* and *Kit* are continued from P. 1.2.5, because there is nothing to cancel them. The term *apit* from P. 1.2.4 is cancelled, because otherwise P. 1.2.6 could have been taken care of by P. 1.2.5.

3. What is the function of *ca* in the present rule ? It does not serve as a boundary marker for the rules P. 1.2.5 and 6, because, in any case, the term *asaṃyogāt* in P. 1.2.5 is incompatible with the mention of *indh*– in P. 1.2.6. Therefore, even without the statement of *ca* we would have to assume that P. 1.2.5 and P. 1.2.6 are different rules. Since it is difficult to attribute a particular function to *ca*, it may be assumed that it serves as an easy device to append a rule which partially at least deals with *chandas* to the earlier body of rules.

4. As explained by the *KV* (and by Patañjali, *Mbh.* I, p. 194, line 18), the verbal base *indh*– has been mentioned, because it forms an exception to P. 1.2.5, since it ends in a conjunct consonant; and *bhū*– has been mentioned, because here the *Pit lIṬ* endings are to be included.

5. The examples quoted by the *KV* for *indh*– are Vedic examples, *sámīdhe dasyuhántamam* 'he has kindled (you), the greatest killer of the Dasyus ' (*ṚgV.* 6.16.15), and *putrá īdhe átharvaṇaḥ* 'the son of the Atharvan has kindled (you) ' (*ṚgV.* 6.16.14).

The perfect form *īdhe* is derived as follows :

(1)	*ÑindhĪ*–	*Dhātup.* 7.11
(2)	*indh* + *lIṬ*	P. 3.2.115
(3)	*indh* + *ta*	P. 3.4.78
(4)	*indh* + *eŚ*	P. 3.4.81

At this stage we cannot make use of the *Kit*– prescription by P. 1.2.5, because *indh*– ends in a conjunct consonant. Still, a *Kit*– prescription for the *lIṬ* endings of *indh*– is needed because the rule (P. 6.4.24) required for the deletion of the prefinal nasal is conditioned by the expression *kniti*. This is precisely where P. 1.2.6 comes in.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Therefore we continue :

(5)	*i°dh*	+ *e*	P. 6.4.24
(6)	*idh* + *idh*	+ *e*	P. 6.1.8
(7)	*i* + *idh*	+ *e*	P. 7.4.60
(8)	*īdh*	+ *e*	P. 6.1.101
	īdhe		

We note that in non-ritual language *indh*- takes a periphrastic perfect in *-ām*, which is not known in Vedic language (see P. 3.1.35, *amantre*).

6. As regards *bhū*-, the *KV* offers the examples *babhūva* 'he has become' and *babhūvitha* 'you (sg.) have become'. Here the augment *vUK* has been added before the perfect endings by P. 6.4.88.

The derivation of *babhūva* is as follows :

(1)	*bhū*-		*Dhātup.* 1.1
(2)	*bhū*	+ *lIṬ*	P. 3.2.115
(3)	*bhū*	+ *tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(4)	*bhū*	+ *ṆaL*	P. 3.4.82

At this stage two rules become simultaneously applicable, namely, P. 6.1.8, which prescribes reduplication, and P. 6.4.88, which prescribes the augment *vUK* before a *lIṬ*- ending beginning with a vowel (P. 6.4.77). Since the *vUK*- rule changes the phonetic form to which the other rule was to become applicable, the *siddha*- principle tells us to apply the *vUK*- rule first.

That gives us :

(5)	*bhū* + *vUK* + *a*	P. 6.4.88

From here we continue :

(6)	*bhūv* + *bhūv*	+ *a*	P. 6.1.8

Here P. 7.3.84 cannot become applicable, because the *aṅga* 'verbal stem' does not end in an *iK*- vowel, and P. 7.3.86 cannot become applicable, because the *aṅga bhūv* has no short prefinal vowel.

Therefore we continue :

(7)	*bhūv* + *bhūv*	+ *a*	P. 7.4.59
(8)	*bhu* + *bhūv*	+ *a*	P. 7.4.60
(9)	*bha* + *bhūv*	+ *a*	P. 7.4.73
(10)	*ba* + *bhūv*	+ *a*	P. 8.4.53
	babhūva.		

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

7. Kātyāyana, *Vt.* I on the present rule, rejects P. 1.2.6 for two reasons. First, he says that the *lIṬ*– forms of *indh*– belong to the domain of *chandas* 'ritual language'. In non-ritual usage *indh*– has a periphrastic perfect. In the case of Vedic usage we don't require a separate rule. Earlier, in *Vt.* I on P. 1.1.6, Kātyāyana had stated that in the derivation of Vedic forms we apply rules by seeing the form as it appears in Vedic usage, not by strictly applying grammatical rules.

As regards *bhū*–, Kātyāyana's idea is that this verbal base has been mentioned to justify *laukika* usage. In the derivation, when the *vUK*– rule P. 6.4.88 co-applies with another rule, the rule prescribing the augment *vUK* is *nitya* 'invariably applicable'. What Kātyāyana means is that the *vUK*– rule prevails. Thus we have another confirmation for *nityatva* in traditional grammar having the same effect as *siddhatva*, for which see under 6. Once *vUK* has been added, the verbal stem becomes *bhūv*–. Here P. 7.3.84 cannot apply for *guṇa*, because *bhūv*– does not end in an *iK*–vowel, nor can P. 7.3.86, because *bhūv*– has no short prefinal vowel. The conclusion is that, in order to have the correct *laukika* forms of *bhū*–, P. 1.2.6 is not required.

However, Kātyāyana's assumption that P. 1.2.6 deals with *laukika* forms of *bhū*– is not correct. The real example for *bhū*– in P. 1.2.6 is the Vedic form *bábhūtha* 'you (sg.) have become', which has been mentioned in P. 6.4.72. The form has been used in the *ṚgV* a number of times, e. g., 1.175.6; 2.18.7; 6.21.8; 7.100.6; 10.6.7; and as an unaccented form in 1.102.9; 6.29.3 and 6.36.4. We cannot maintain that in *bábhūtha guṇa* by P. 7.3.84 has been prevented on account of *nipātana*, its mention as a ready-made form in P. 6.4.72. The reason is that *nipātana* rules are to be interpreted contextually. In the case of P. 6.4.72 the context is that of prohibiting *iḍāgama*, not that of prohibiting *guṇa*. Therefore, in order to prohibit *guṇa* here, a separate rule is required. That rule is P. 1.2.6.

In the derivation of *bábhūtha* the marker *lIṬ* is first replaced by *siP* (P. 3.4.78), then by *thaL* (P. 3.4.82). *Iḍāgama* prescribed by P. 7.2.35 is prohibited by P. 7.2.64.

1.2.7 MṚḌAMṚDAGUDHAKUṢAKLIŚAVADAVASAḤ KTVĀ '(when added) after (the verbal bases) *mṛḍ*– "to show mercy", *mṛd*– "to crush", *gudh*– "to envelop", *kuṣ*– "to tear off", *Kliś*– "to suffer" and *vas*– "to dwell" (the suffix) *Ktvā* (is regarded as marked with *K*).'

1. Like the preceding *sūtras* the present rule is an *atideśasūtra*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

2. By the introduction of a new topic the previous topic *indhibhavatibhyām* is discontinued. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4. The mention of *Ktvā* cancels the term *lIṬ* which was continued from P. 2.1.5. The *vidheya kit* is continued.

3. Since *Ktvā* is *Kit*, why is the present rule required ? As pointed out by the *KV*, there is a later rule, namely, P. 1.2.18, which says that when *Ktvā* takes the augment *iṬ*, it is not to be considered *Kit*. P. 1.2.7 states an exception to this rule, on beforehand. When *Ktvā* is added to the verbal bases mentioned here, it is still to be regarded as *Kit* even when the augment *iṬ* is added.

4. One of the examples mentioned by the *KV* is *uṣitvā* 'after having dwelled'. It is derived as follows :

(1) *vasA–*		*Dhātup.* 1.1054
(2) *vas*	+ *Ktvā*	P. 3.4.21
(3) *vas* + *iṬ*	+ *tvā*	P. 7.2.35
(4) *us* + *i*	+ *tvā*	P. 6.1.15; 6.1.108
(5) *uṣ* + *i*	+ *tvā*	P. 8.3.60
uṣitvā.		

In stage (4) *guṇa* of the prefinal verbal base vowel would become applicable by P. 7.3.86. This is not desired. It is prohibited by the statement of *Kittva* by the present rule.

5. The form *mṛḍitvā* is attested in the *Vādhula Śrautasūtra* 4.74.9. The form *uṣitvā* we find in the *Taitt. Saṃh.* 3.4.10.8; *Śatap. Br.* 14.8.2.2 and *Jaim. Br.* 3.2.8 and elsewhere.

1.2.8 (a) RUDAVIDAMUṢAGRAHISVAPIPRACCHAH '(when added) after (the verbal bases) *rud–* "to weep", *vid–* "to know", *muṣ–* "to steal", *grah–* "to seize", *svap–* "to sleep" and pracch– "to ask" (the suffix *Ktvā* is regarded as marked with *K*)'.

1. The rule translated here is not P. 1.2.8 in its traditional form. We propose to divide the rule into two, as follows :

P. 1.2.8 (a) *rudavidamuṣagrahisvapipracchaḥ*

P. 1.2.8 (b) *saṃś ca*.

The reason for this division of the text is that the only function which can be reasonably assigned to *ca* is that of boundary marker. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 232–3.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

2. Both the (a) and the (b) rules are *atideśasūtras.*

3. In the (a) rule, by the introduction of a new *uddeśya*, the earlier topic *mṛḍmṛd–*, etc. has been cancelled. The *vidheya ktvā kit* is continued.

4. What is the point here in re–affirming the *Kittva* of *Ktvā* ? Whereas in P. 1.2.7 the point of re–affirming the *Kittva* of *Ktvā* was to ensure that *Ktvā* is *Kit* even when it takes *iḍāgama*, against P. 1.2.18, the statement of *Kittva* by the present rule serves different purposes. As explained by the *KV*, in connection with *rud–*, *vid–* and *muṣ–*, which are *halādi ralanta* bases, the suffix *Ktvā* would be optionally *Kit*, by P. 1.2.26. Therefore *guṇa* by P. 7.3.86 would be optionally allowed. This is not desired. It is prohibited by the statement of *Kittva* by the present rule.

In the case of *grah–* the statement of *Kittva* by the present rule ensures *saṃprasāraṇa* by P. 6.1.16, and prohibits *guṇa* of the *saṃprasāraṇa* vowel which was applicable by P. 7.3.86.

In the case of *svap–* and *pracch–* the statement of *Kittva* by the present rule ensures *saṃprasāraṇa* by P. 6.1.15 and 16. It also serves to prohibit *guṇa* of the *saṃprasāraṇa* vowel applicable by P. 7.3.86 in the case of *svap–*. Since *pracch–* has no *iK* vowel in prefinal position P. 7.3.86 cannot become applicable.

5. Among many occurrences of *viditvā* we mention *Kāṭhaka Saṃh.* 35.2.2; *Kaṭha Up.* 1.1.17; and *Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra* 7.12. For *gṛhītvā* we refer to *Taitt. Saṃh* 1.6.8.4. The alternative form *gṛbhītvā* (*Vt.* I on P. 8.2.32) is attested in two recensions of the Atharvaveda, *Śaunaka* 12.3.20 and *Paippalāda* 17.37.10.

1.2.8 (b) SAṂŚ CA 'also (the suffix) *saN* (is regarded as marked with *K*, when added after the verbal bases mentioned) '.

1. This is an *atideśasūtra.*

2. The *uddeśya rud–*, etc. is continued. The earlier part *vidheya Ktvā* is cancelled by the introduction of *saN*. The other part *vidheya kit* is continued.

3. The purpose of the present rule in declaring the suffix *saN* to be *Kit* is to prohibit *guṇa* applicable to the verbal stem vowel by P. 7.3.86, and to allow *saṃprasāraṇa*, which is conditioned by the expression *kiti*, by P. 6.1.15–16.

4. One of the examples quoted by the *KV* is *jighṛkṣati* 'he desires to seize'. The derivation is as follows :

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(1)		*grahA–*			*Dhātup.* 9.61
(2)		*grah*	+ *saN*		P. 3.1.7
Here *iḍāgama* is prohibited by					P. 7.2.12
(3)		*gṛh*	+ *sa*		P. 6.1.16; 6.1.108
(4)	*gṛh*	+ *gṛh*	+ *sa*		P. 6.1.9
(5)	*garh*	+ *gṛh*	+ *sa*		P. 7.4.66; 1.1.51
(6)	*ga*	+ *gṛh*	+ *sa*		P. 7.4.60
(7)	*ja*	+ *gṛh*	+ *sa*		P. 7.4.62
(8)	*ji*	+ *gṛh*	+ *sa*		P. 7.4.79
(9)	*ji*	+ *gṛh*	+ *sa*	+ *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(10)	*ji*	+ *gṛh*	+ *sa*	+ *tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(11)	*ji*	+ *gṛh*	+ *sa* + *ŚaP*	+ *ti*	P. 3.1.68
(12)	*ji*	+ *gṛh*	+ *sa*	+ *ti*	P. 6.1.97
(13)	*ji*	+ *gṛḍh*	+ *sa*	+ *ti*	P. 8.2.31
(14)	*ji*	+ *ghṛḍh*	+ *sa*	+ *ti*	P. 8.2.37
(15)	*ji*	+ *ghṛk*	+ *sa*	+ *ti*	P. 8.2.41
(16)	*ji*	+ *ghṛk*	+ *ṣa*	+ *ti*	P. 8.3.59
	jighṛkṣati.				

5. The form *jighṛkṣati* is found in *Muṇḍaka Up.* 1.1.7; *ajighṛkṣat* in *Ait. Up.* 3.3.10.

The form *vividiṣati* occurs in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up.* 4.4.22 and *Śatap. Br.* 14.7.2.25.

1.2.9 IKO JHAL, '(when added) after (a verbal base) ending in an *iK*-vowel (the suffix *saN*) when beginning with a *jhaL*-letter (is regarded as marked with *K*)'.

1. This is an *atideśasūtra.*

2. The word *ikaḥ* which functions as the qualifier of the implied word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' is interpreted as *igantāt* 'after (a verbel base) ending in an *iK*-vowel' by applying the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72).

The word *jhal* is interpreted as *jhal ādir yasya sa sanpratyayaḥ* 'that suffix *saN* which begins with a *jhaL*-letter'. Here the *tadantavidhi* cannot be applied, because *saN*, as an *aupadeśika* form, does not end in a *jhaL*-letter (any consonant, except semivowels and nasals). Then how to construe the sequence *jhal san?* Both words being nominative words stand in syntactic agreement. They therefore refer to one and the same item. Consequently, since the interpretation *jhalantaḥ san* is out of the question, the only possibility

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

left is *jhalādiḥ san* '(the suffix) *saN* which begins with a *jhaL*–letter'. Compare P. 1.1.2, under 3. What is meant by *jhalādiḥ san* is the suffix *saN* to which the augment *iṬ* is not added.

3. The *uddeśya san* is continued from P. 1.2.8 (b). The *vidheya kit* is continued from P. 2.1.5.

4. The purpose of the rule is to prevent *guṇa* of the verbal stem vowel, applicable by P. 7.3.84. One of the examples offered by the *KV* is *cicīṣati* 'he wishes to collect together'. It is derived as follows :

(1)	*ciÑ–*		*Dhātup.* 5.5
(2)	*ci + saN*		P. 3.1.7
(3)	*cī + sa*		P. 6.4.16
(4)	*cī + cī + sa*		P. 6.1.9
(5)	*ci + cī + sa*		P. 7.4.59
(6)	*ci + cī + sa*	*+ lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(7)	*ci + cī + sa*	*+ tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(8)	*ci + cī + sa + ŚaP*	*+ ti*	P. 3.1.68
(9)	*ci + cī + sa*	*+ ti*	P. 6.1.97
(10)	*ci + cī + ṣa*	*+ ti*	P. 8.3.59
	cicīṣati.		

5. At the end of the *KV* on the present rule two *ślokas* are quoted from Patañjali's *bhāṣya* here (*Mbh.* I, p. 197, lines 8–11). The *ślokas* themselves, in an extremely condensed form, state the gist of the grammatical argument on P. 1.2.9. The idea of the *ślokakāra*, whom Patañjali follows, is that the purpose of the present rule is to allow the deletion (*lopa*) of *Ṇi* (as prescribed by P. 6.4.51), in forms like *jñīpsati* 'he wishes to inform'. This leads Patañjali to exclaim *kvāstāḥ kva nipatitāḥ. Kva kittvaṃ kva ṇilopaḥ* 'where have (the arrows) been shot (and) where have they fallen? What has *Kittva* to do with the deletion of *Ṇi*?' (*Mbh.* I, p. 196, lines 25–26).

The whole of Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on P. 1.2.9 provides an interesting insight in what must have been Patañjali's *Vorlage*, and in the way Patañjali develops, expands and explains a condensed argument.

1.2.10 HALANTĀC CA 'also (the suffix *saN* when beginning with a *jhaL* letter, coming after a form ending in a consonant which comes after an *iK*–vowel of a verbal base is regarded as marked with *K*)'.

1. This is an *atideśasūtra*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

2. The word *ca* marks the boundary with the preceding rule. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 232-3.

3. The whole of P. 1.2.9 plus the words *san* (P. 1.2.8 (b)) and *kit* (P. 1.2.5) are continued.

The *uddeśya* is *ikaḥ halantāt jhal san*. The *vidheya* is *kit*.

4. The difficulty in the rule is of course, the expression *halantāt* 'after (a verbal base) which ends in a consonant'. As Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 197, line 13) says, the rule has been inappropriately phrased. How can what ends in an *iK*- vowel end in a consonant ?

We note that P. 1.2.9 uses the word *ikaḥ* which is duly interpreted as *igantāt* (*dhātoḥ*). In P. 1.2.10, however, we find the expression *halantāt*. Why not *halaḥ* ? The reason is that the expression *halaḥ* would have cancelled *ikaḥ*. This is not desired. The expression *halantāt*, on the other hand, does not cancel *ikaḥ*. But then, how can the expressions *ikaḥ* = *igantāt* and *halantāt* be combined ?

Patañjali's suggestion is that the word *anta* in *halanta* conveys the sense of *sāmīpya* 'nearness', as it does in *udakāntaṃ gataḥ* 'he went near the water' (*Mbh.* I, p. 197, line 18). Accordingly, tradition interprets P. 1.2.10 as *iksamīpād halaḥ paraḥ san jhalādiḥ* '(the suffix) *saN* when beginning with a *jhaL*-letter coming after a consonant which is near to the *iK*-vowel, after (a verbal base). Clearly, what Patañjali means is that the verbal base referred to by P. 1.2.10 must end in a consonant preceded by an *iK*-vowel.

Strictly speaking, the form *ikaḥ* (interpreted as *igantāt* '(added) after (a verbal base) ending in an *iK*-vowel' in P. 1.2.9 and the *anuvṛtti* form *ikaḥ* in P. 1.2.10 do not convey the same meaning, although both are technical ablatives (P. 1.1.67). The difficulty in the formulation of P. 1.2.10 is how to express a sequence of two linguistic items. What P. 1.2.10 means is best expressed as *ikaḥ paraḥ yaḥ hal tadantāt jhalādiḥ san kit* '*saN*, when beginning with a *jhaL*-letter, coming after such a form which ends in a consonant which (itself) comes after an *iK*-vowel (of a verbal base) (is regarded as) *Kit*'.

We note that the interpretation of *anta* as *samīpa* suggested by Patañjali requires *vibhaktiviparināma* for *ikaḥ*, namely, its interpretation as a genitive form. But this can be avoided, if the interpretation mentioned above is accepted.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. One of the examples offered by the *KV* is *bibhitsati* 'he wishes to break asunder'. It is derived as follows :

(1)	*bhidiR–*	*Dhātup.* 7.2
(2)	*bhid* + *saN*	P. 3.1.7

Since *saN* which does not take *iṬ* is regarded as *Kit* after a verbal base ending in a consonant preceded by an *iK*–vowel, by the present rule, *guṇa* by P. 7.3.86 is prohibited. We therefore continue :

(3)	*bhid* + *bhid* + *sa*	P. 6.1.9
(4)	*bhi°* + *bhid* + *sa*	P. 7.4.60
(5)	*bhi* + *bhid* + *sa* + *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(6)	*bhi* + *bhid* + *sa* + *tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(7)	*bhi* + *bhid* + *sa* + *ŚaP* + *ti*	P. 3.1.68
(8)	*bhi* + *bhid* + *sa* + *ti*	P. 6.1.97
(9)	*bi°* + *bhid* + *sa* + *ti*	P. 8.4.54
(10)	*bi* + *bhit* + *sa* + *ti*	P. 8.4.55
	bibhitsati.	

The form *bibhitsat* is attested in the *ṚgV.* 10.61.13.

6. A counterexample offered by the *KV* is *yiyakṣati* 'he wishes to sacrifice'. Here the verbal base ends in a consonant which is not preceded by an *iK*–vowel. Therefore the suffix *saN* is not regarded as *Kit*. As a result, *saṃprasāraṇa* (by P. 6.1.15) is not allowed. The derivation is as follows :

(1)	*yajA–*	*Dhātup.* 1.1051
(2)	*yaj* + *saN*	P. 3.1.7
(3)	*yaj* + *yaj* + *sa*	P. 6.1.9
(4)	*ya* + *yaj* + *sa*	P. 7.4.60
(5)	*yi* + *yaj* + *sa*	P. 7.4.79
(6)	*yi* + *yaj* + *sa* + *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(7)	*yi* + *yaj* + *sa* + *tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(8)	*yi* + *yaj* + *sa* + *ŚaP* + *ti*	P. 3.1.68
(9)	*yi* + *yaj* + *sa* + *ti*	P. 6.1.97
(10)	*yi* + *yag* + *sa* + *ti*	P. 8.2.30
(11)	*yi* + *yag* + *ṣa* + *ti*	P. 8.3.59
(12)	*yi* + *yak* + *ṣa* + *ti*	P. 8.4.55
	yiyakṣati.	

1.2.11 LIṄSICĀV ĀTMANEPADEṢU '(when added after a form ending in the consonant which comes after an *iK*– vowel of a verbal base, the precative

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

marker) *lIṄ* and (the suffix) *sIC* (when beginning with a *jhaL*–letter, are regarded as marked with *K*), when the question is of (adding) *ātmanepada* endings '.

1. This is an *atideśasūtra*.

2. *LIṄ* here is the marker of the precative prescribed in the sense of *āśis* ' blessing ' by P. 3.3.173. The suffix *sIC* replaces *ClI*, when the aorist marker *lUṄ* is added, by P. 3.1.44.

3. The locative word *ātmanepadeṣu* is not to be interpreted as a technical locative (P. 1.1.66), but as a *viṣayasaptamī* ' locative ending indicating a domain/environment '. The reason is that *lIṄ* itself represents *ātmanepada* endings, and can, therefore, not be followed by *ātmanepada* endings. The suffix *sIC*, however, can. It follows that what the *KV* says, namely, *liṅsicau ātmanepadeṣu parataḥ* ' *lIṄ* and *sIC* followed by *ātmanepada* endings ' is only partly correct.

Sometimes Pāṇini uses the expression *ātmanepade* in the sg., sometimes *ātmanepadeṣu* in the pl. without an apparent difference of meaning. One may wonder whether the difference in form goes back to an originally versified text of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as determined by metre.

4. For the translation of the rule see P. 1.2.10, under 4.

5. The purpose of the rule is to prevent *guṇa*, applicable by P. 7.3.86, of the verbal stem vowel.

6. One of the examples for *lIṄ* offered by the *KV* is *bhitsīṣṭa* ! may he break (something) asunder '. Compare Whitney, paras 921, ff. The derivation is as follows :

(1)	*bhidiR–*		*Dhātup.* 7.2
(2)	*bhid*	+ *lIṄ*	P. 3.3.173
(3)	*bhid*	+ *ta*	P. 3.4.78
(4)	*bhid* + *sīyUṬ*	+ *ta*	P. 3.4.102
(5)	*bhid* + *sīy* + *sUṬ*	+ *ta*	P. 3.4.107
(6)	*bhid* + *sī°* + *s*	+ *ta*	P. 6.1.66
(7)	*bhid* + *sī* + *ṣ*	+ *ta*	P. 8.3.59
(8)	*bhid* + *sī* + *ṣ*	+ *ṭa*	P. 8.4.41
(9)	*bhit* + *sī* + *ṣ*	+ *ṭa*	P. 8.4.55
	bhitsīṣṭa.		

Since *lIṄ* and its replacements when beginning with a *jhaL*–letter are regarded as *Kit* by the present rule, *guṇa* by P. 7.3.86 is not applied to the verbal stem vowel.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The whole sequence *-sīṣṭa* may be considered to be *lIṄ*, because *sīyUṬ* and *sUṬ* are augments, added as initial parts to the *lIṄ*-replacements by P. 1.1.49. The relation between *lIṄ* and its replacements is obviously that of *sthānyādeśabhāva*.

7. One of the examples offered by the *KV* for *sIC* is *abhitta* ' he broke (something) asunder ' (3rd sg. aor.). It is derived as follows :

(1)	*bhidiR-*	*Dhātup.* 7.2
(2)	*bhid* + *lUṄ*	P. 3.2.110
(3)	*a* + *bhid* + *lUṄ*	P. 6.4.71
(4)	*a* + *bhid* + *ta*	P. 3.4.78
(5)	*a* + *bhid* + *ClI* + *ta*	P. 3.1.43
(6)	*a* + *bhid* + *sIC* + *ta*	P. 3.1.44
(7)	*a* + *bhid* + ° + *ta*	P. 8.2.26

After the deletion of *sIC*, any grammatical operations dependant on the suffix remain in force, by P. 1.1.62. Therefore *guṇa* by P. 7.3.86 becomes applicable. This is not desired. It is prevented by the present rule. We therefore continue,

(8)	*a* + *bhit* + *ta*	P. 8.4.55
	abhitta.	

1.2.12 UŚ CA ' also (when added) after (a verbal base) ending in *ṛ* (the precative marker *lIṄ* and the suffix *sIC* when beginning with a *jhaL*-letter, are regarded as marked with *K*, when the question is of adding *ātmanepada* endings) '.

1. This is an *atideśasūtra*.

2. The whole of the previous rule is continued. The word *ikaḥ* = *igantāt* (*dhātoḥ*) ' after a verbal base ending in an *iK*-vowel ' is practically cancelled by *uḥ* = *ṛkārāntāt* = (*dhātoḥ*) ' after a verbal base ending in *ṛ* ', although, strictly speaking, the sequence is *ikaḥ uḥ* ' after (a verbal base) ending in an *iK*-vowel which happens to be *ṛ* '.

3. The word *uḥ* which functions as a qualifier of the implied word *dhātoḥ* is interpreted as *ṛkāra-antāt* by the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72).

4. The particle *ca* marks the boundary of the preceding rule. See Joshi- Bhate 1984, p. 232-3. Tradition also accepts P. 1.2.12 as a separate rule, as opposed to *saṃś ca* considered as part of P. 1.2.8.

5. The *uddeśya* is *uḥ liṅsicau jhalādī ātmanepadeṣu*. The *vidheya* is *kit*, continued from P. 1.2.5.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

6. The purpose of the rule is to prevent *guṇa*, applicable by P. 7.3.84, of the verbal stem vowel.

7. One of the examples offered by the *KV* for *lIṄ* is *kṛṣīṣṭa* 'may he do'. It is derived as follows :

(1)	*ḌUkṛÑ*			*Dhātup.* 8.10
(2)	*kṛ*		+ *lIṄ*	P. 3.3.173
(3)	*kṛ*		+ *ta*	P. 3.4.78
(4)	*kṛ* + *sīyUṬ*		+ *ta*	P. 3.4.102
(5)	*kṛ* + *sīy*	+ *sUṬ*	+ *ta*	P. 3.4.107
(6)	*kṛ* + *sī*°	+ *s*	+ *ta*	P. 6.1.66
(7)	*kṛ* + *ṣī*	+ *ṣ*	+ *ta*	P. 8.3.59
(8)	*kṛ* + *ṣī*	+ *ṣ*	+ *ṭa*	P. 8.4.41
	kṛṣīṣṭa.			

Since *lIṄ* and its replacements when beginning with a *jhaL*-letter, that is, when not taking the augment *iṬ*, are regarded as *Kit* in connection with a verbal base ending in *ṛ*, *guṇa* by P. 7.3.84 is not applied to the verbal stem vowel.

8. One of the examples offered by the *KV* for *sIC* is *akṛta* 'he did' (3rd sg. s-aorist). The derivation is as follows :

(1)		*ḌUkṛÑ*–		*Dhātup.* 8.10
(2)		*kṛ*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.2.110
(3)	*a* +	*kṛ*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 6.4.71
(4)	*a* +	*kṛ*	+ *ta*	P. 3.4.78
(5)	*a* +	*kṛ*	+ *ClI* + *ta*	P. 3.1.43
(6)	*a* +	*kṛ*	+ *sIC* + *ta*	P. 3.1.44
(7)	*a* +	*kṛ*	+ ° + *ta*	P. 8.2.27
	akṛta.			

After the deletion of the suffix *sIC* in stage (7) any grammatical operations dependent on this suffix remain in force, by P. 1.1.62. Therefore *guṇa* of the verbal stem vowel by P. 7.3.84 becomes applicable. But this is not desired. It is prevented by the present rule.

9. On the rules P. 1.2.12–16 no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali is available.

1.2.13 VĀ GAMAḤ '(when added) after (the verbal base) *gam*– 'to go' (the precative marker *lIṄ* and the suffix *sIC*, when beginning with a *jhaL*–-letter are) preferably (regarded as marked with *K*, when the question is of adding *ātmanepada* endings)'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1. This is an *atideśasūtra*.

2. The whole of P. 1.2.11 is continued, including the word *jhal* = *jhalādi*, for which see P. 1.2.14, under 2. The word (*ikaḥ*) *uḥ* from the previous rule is cancelled by *gamaḥ*.

3. By means of the word *vā* Pāṇini registers a stylistic preference among variant forms. In fact, *vā* is used to indicate the preferred option. See Kiparski 1979, p. 1.

4. The *uddeśya* is *gamaḥ liṅsicau jhalādī ātmanepadeṣu*. The *vidheya* is *kit*, continued from p. 1.2.5.

5. The purpose of the rule is to allow the deletion of the *m* of *gam*– by p. 6.4.37, which is conditioned by the expression *kṅiti*.

6. One of the examples offered by the *KV* for *lIṄ* is *saṃgaṃsīṣṭa* 'may he come together'. The derivation is as follows :

(1)	*gamḶ–*		*Dhātup.* 1.1031
(2)	*sam* + *gam*		
(3)	*sam* + *gam*	+ *lIṄ*	P. 3.3.173
(4)	*sam* + *gam*	+ *ta*	P. 1.3.29; 3.4.78
(5)	*sam* + *gam̐* + *sīyUṬ*	+ *ta*	P. 3.4.102
(6)	*sam* + *gam* + *sīy* + *sUṬ*	+ *ta*	P. 3.4.107
(7)	*sam* + *gam* + *sī°* + *s*	+ *ta*	P. 6.1.66
(8)	*saṃ* + *gam* + *sī* + *s*	+ *ta*	P. 8.3.24
(9)	*saṃ* + *gaṃ* + *sī* + *s*	+ *ta*	P. 8.3.24
(10)	*saṃ* + *gaṃ* + *sī* + *ṣ*	+ *ta*	P. 8.3.59
(11)	*saṃ* + *gaṃ* + *sī* + *ṣ*	+ *ṭa*	P. 8.4.41
	saṃgaṃsīṣṭa		

This is the less preferred option. When *lIṄ* is regarded as *Kit*, the *m* of *gam* is deleted by P. 6.4.37. That gives us the preferred form *saṃgasīṣṭa*.

7. One of the examples offered by the *KV* for *sIC* is *samagata* 'he came together' (3rd sg. s–aorist). The derivation is as follows :

(1)	*gamḶ–*		*Dhātup.* 1.1031
(2)	*sam* + *gam*		
(3)	*sam* + *gam*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.2.110
(4)	*sam* + *a* + *gam*	+ *ta*	P. 1.3.29; 3.4.78
(5)	*sam* + *a* + *gam* + *ClI*	+ *ta*	P. 3.1.43
(6)	*sam* + *a* + *gam* + *sIC*	+ *ta*	P. 3.1.44

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

In this stage, if *sIC* is regarded as *kit*, we delete the *m* of *gam* by P. 6.4.37. That gives us

(7) *sam* + *a* + *ga*° + *s* + *ta* P. 6.4.37

From here we continue

(8) *sam* + *a* + *ga* + ° + *ta* P. 8.2.27
samagata.

This is the preferred option. When *sIC* is not regarded as *Kit*, the *m* of *gam* will not be deleted, and we derive the form *samagaṃsta* by applying P. 8.3.24.

8. As stated by Kiparski 1979, p. 88, the forms in which the *m* is deleted are predominant in Vedic language. After the Vedic and *sūtra* period the forms with *m* become the regular ones. Pāṇini's expressed preference therefore agrees with the pre-classical state of language.

1.2.14 HANAḤ SIC ' (when added) after (the verbal base) *han*– " to kill " (the suffix) *sIC* (when beginning with a *jhaL*–letter is regarded as marked with *K*, when the question is of adding *ātmanepada* endings) '.

1. This is an *atideśasūtra*.

2. The mention of *hanaḥ* cancels that of the incompatible item *gamaḥ* from the previous rule.

The mention of *sic* in the present rule becomes purposeful, only, if it is assumed that the constituents of the *dvandva* cp. *liṅsicau* are discontinued together. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 249–50. It follows that the word *vā* which in P. 1.2.13 is connected with *liṅsicau* is also discontinued in P. 1.2.14.

The verbal bases *gam*–, *han*– and *yam*–, mentioned in P. 1.2.13–15, are all of them *aniṭ* bases. Therefore, strictly speaking, the continuation of the word *jhal* = *jhalādi* in the present rule serves no purpose. But redundant items may be theoretically continued, see Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 41. In fact, the word *jhal* in P. 1.2.9 is continued up to P. 1.2.18, where it is discontinued by the word *seṭ*.

3. The *uddeśya* is *hanaḥ sic jhalādi ātmanepadeṣu*. The *vidheya* is *kit*.

4. The purpose of the rule is to allow the deletion of the *n* of *han*– by P. 6.4.37, which is conditioned by the expression *kniti*.

5. One of the examples offered by the *KV* is *āhata* ' he killed ' (3rd sg. s-aorist). The derivation is as follows :

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(1)		*hanA–*			*Dhātup.* 2.2
(2)	*ā*	+ *han*			
(3)	*ā*	+ *han*		+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.2.110
(4)	*ā* + *a*	+ *han*		+ *lUṄ*	P. 6.4.71
(5)	*ā*	+ *han*		+ *lUṄ*	P. 6.1.101
(6)	*ā*	+ *han*		+ *ta*	P. 1.3.28; 3.4.78
(7)	*ā*	+ *han*	+ *ClI*	+ *ta*	P. 3.1.43
(8)	*ā*	+ *han*	+ *sIC*	+ *ta*	P. 3.1.44
(9)	*ā*	+ *ha°*	+ *s*	+ *ta*	P. 6.4.37
(10)	*ā*	+ *ha*	+ °	+ *ta*	P. 8.2.27
	āhata.				

In stage (8), since *sIC* is regarded as *Kit* by the present rule, we apply P. 6.4.37 for the deletion of the verbal stem final *n*.

1.2.15 YAMO GANDHANE '(when added) after (the verbal base) *yam–* in the sense of " to disclose " (the suffix *sIC*, when beginning with a *jhaL–* letter, is regarded as marked with *K*, when the question is of adding *ātmanepada* endings) '.

1. This is an *atideśasūtra*.

2. The mention of *yamaḥ* cancels that of *hanaḥ* from the previous rule. The word *sic* is continued from P. 1.2.14. The words *jhal*, *ātmanepadeṣu* and *kit* are also continued. For *jhal* see P. 1.2.14, under 2.

3. The locative word *gandhane* stands for a meaning condition.

4. The *uddeśya* is *yamaḥ gandhane sic jhalādi ātmanepadeṣu*. The *vidheya* is *kit*.

5. The purpose of the rule is to allow the deletion of the *m* of *yam* by P. 6.4.37, which is conditioned by the expression *kniti*.

6. One of the examples offered by the *KV* is *udāyata* 'he disclosed' (3rd sg. s–aorist). The derivation is as follows :

(1)		*yamA–*			*Dhātup.* 1.1033
(2)	*ud* + *ā*	+ *yam*			
(3)	*ud* + *ā*	+ *yam*		+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.2.110
(4)	*ud* + *ā* + *a*	+ *yam*		+ *lUṄ*	P. 6.4.71
(5)	*ud* + *ā*	+ *yam*		+ *lUṄ*	P. 6.1.101
(6)	*ud* + *ā*	+ *yam*		+ *ta*	P. 1.3.75; 3.4.78
(7)	*ud* + *ā*	+ *yam*	+ *ClI*	+ *ta*	P. 3.1.43

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(8)	*ud* + *ā*	+ *yam*	+ *sIC*	+ *ta*	P. 3.1.44
(9)	*ud* + *ā*	+ *ya*°	+ *s*	+ *ta*	P. 6.4.37
(10)	*ud* + *ā*	+ *ya*	+ °	+ *ta*	P. 8.2.27

udāyata.

In stage (8), since *sIC* is regarded as *Kit* by the present rule, we apply P. 6.4.37 for the deletion of the verbal stem final *m*.

7. A counterexample offered by the *KV* is *udāyaṃsta pādam* 'he raised his foot'. Here *sIC* is not regarded as *Kit*, because the sense of *gandhana* 'disclosure' is not conveyed. Therefore deletion of the final *m* of *yam*– does not take place. Instead, the *m* becomes *anusvāra* by P. 8.3.24.

1.2.16 VIBHĀṢOPAYAMANE '(when added after the verbal base *yam*–) in the sense of "to marry" (the suffix *sIC*, when beginning with a *jhaL*– letter, is regarded as marked with *K* as the less preferred option, when the question is of adding *ātmanepada* endings)'.

1. This is an *atideśasūtra.*

2. P. 1.2.16 is also an associative digression in the sense that it extends a *vidheya* to a new environment in the form of a modifier. The modifier here is the term *vibhāṣā*. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 197, under (17) (iii), p. 204, and p. 70. Since P. 1.2.16 is an associative digression, items, including the term *vibhāṣā*, are not continued in subsequent rules.

3. The words continued are *yamaḥ* (P. 1.2.15), *sic* (P. 2.1.14), *jhal* (P. 1.2.9) and *ātmanepadeṣu* (P. 1.2.11). For *jhal* see P. 1.2.14, under 2. The mention of *upayamane* cancels that of *gandhane* from the previous rule.

4. The locative word *upayamane* stands for a meaning condtion.

5. The *uddeśya* is *yamaḥ upayamane sic jhalādi ātmanepadeṣu.* The *vidheya* is *vibhāṣā kit.*

6. The purpose of the rule is to allow, by way of less preferred option, the deletion of the *m* of *yam*– by P. 6.4.37, which is conditioned by the expression *kniti.* Accordingly, the preferred form of the 3rd sg. s–aorist is *upāyaṃsta*, as in *upāyaṃsta kanyām* 'he married a girl'. The less preferred form is *upāyata.* For the derivation compare P. 1.2.15, *udāyata.* For the derivation of *upāyaṃsta* apply P. 1.3.56 (for the *ātmanepada* ending) and P. 8.3.24 (for the *anusvāra*) in addition.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

7. As stated by Kiparski 1979, p. 88–89, the forms *upāyaṃsta* and *upāyata* are not attested in literature before the 7th cent. A. D., and then mostly in Jaina narratives.

1.2.17 (a) STHĀGHVOḤ '(when added) after (the verbal base) *sthā*– " to place " and (the verbal bases called) *ghu* (the suffix *sIC*, when beginning with a *jhaL*–letter, is regarded as marked with *K*, when the question is of adding *ātmanepada* endings) '.

1. The rule translated here is not P. 1.2.17 in its traditional wording. We propose to divide the rule into two, as follows :

P. 1.2.17 (a) *sthāghvoḥ*.

P. 1.2.17 (b) *ic ca*.

The reasons for this division of the text are three. First, the (a) and (b) rules have different *vidheyas*, namely, *kit* and *it*. Secondly, the word *ca* should not come after the second word of a *sūtra*. Thirdly, the only function which can be reasonably assigned to *ca* here is that of boundary marker. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 204.

2. P. 1.2.17 (a) is an *atideśasūtra*.

3. In P. 1.2.17 (a), by the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya*, namely, *sthāghvoḥ*, the earlier topic *yamaḥ upayamane* from P. 1.2.16 has been discontinued. The *vidheya kit* from P. 1.2.5 is continued.

The option term *vibhāṣā* from P. 1.2.16 is discontinued, because it occurs in a rule which itself is an associative digression. Items from an associative digression are not continued in subsequent rules. See P. 1.2.16, under 2.

4. The term *ghu* has been defined by P. 1.2.20.

1.2.17 (b) IC CA ' and short *i* (is substituted for the verbal base vowel) '.

1. For the proposed division of the rule see P. 1.2.17 (a), under 1.

2. This is a *vidhisūtra*. It prescribes vowel–substitution.

3. P. 1.2.17 (b) is to be regarded as another associative digression, after P. 1 2.16. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 197, under (17) i.

4. As stated by the *KV*, the *i* comes in the place of the final vowel of the verbal bases mentioned, according to P. 1.1.52.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. The purpose of the (a) rule is to prevent *guṇa* of the substituted vowel *i*, applicable by P. 7.3.84.

6. One of the examples offered by the *KV* is *upāsthita* 'he worshipped' (3rd sg. s-aorist). The derivation is as follows :

(1)		*sthā-*		*Dhātup.* 1.975
(2)	*upa*	+ *sthā*		
(3)	*upa*	+ *sthā*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.2.110
(4)	*upa* + *a*	+ *sthā*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 6.4.71
(5)	*upā*	+ *sthā*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 6.1.101
(6)	*upā*	+ *sthā*	+ *ta*	P. 1.3.25; 3.4.78
(7)	*upā*	+ *sthā* + *ClI*	+ *ta*	P. 3.1.43
(8)	*upā*	+ *sthā* + *sIC*	+ *ta*	P. 3.1.44
(9)	*upā*	+ *sthi* + *s*	+ *ta*	P. 1.2.17 (b)
(10)	*upā*	+ *sthi* + °	+ *ta*	P. 8.2.27
	upāsthita.			

In stage (9) *guṇa* of the verbal stem vowel applicable by P. 7.3.84 is prevented, because, by the present (a) rule *sIC* is declared *Kit.*

7. At the end of the commentary on P. 1.2.17 the *KV* quotes a *śloka* from Patañjali's *bhāṣya* here (*Mbh.* I, p. 199, lines 3-4). The question is raised why in P. 1.2.17 (b) in the mention of *it* the *T* has been added. Reference is made to P. 1.1.70, which says that the purpose of adding *T* is to restrict a vowel to the variety mentioned only. Otherwise, by P. 1.1.50, the substitute vowel would have been long *ī*.

1.2.18 NA KTVĀ SEṬ '(the suffix) *Ktvā*, when it takes (the augment) *iṬ* (is) not (regarded as marked with *K*)'.

1. This is a prohibition of *Kittva* regarding the suffix *Ktvā* (P. 3.4.21) which in its *aupadeśika* form is *Kit.*

2. The *uddeśya* is *ktvā seṭ*. By the introduction of the new *uddeśya* the earlier topic *sic* (P. 1.2.14) *jhal* (P. 1.2.9) *ātmanepadeṣu* (P. 1.2.11) is discontinued.

The *vidheya* is *na kit*, in which *kit* is continued from P. 1.2.5.

3. The purpose of the rule is to allow *guṇa* of the verbal stem vowel by P. 7.3.86, which would otherwise have been prohibited by P. 1.1.5.

4. One of the examples offered by the *KV* is *devitvā* 'after having gambled'. The derivation is as follows :

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(1) *divU–*		*Dhātup.* 4.1
(2) *div*	+ *Ktvā*	P. 3.4.21
(3) *div* + *iṬ*	+ *tvā*	P. 7.2.35
(4) *dev* + *i*	+ *tvā*	P. 7.3.86
devitvā.		

If *Ktvā* in conjunction with the augment *iṬ* would have been regarded as *kit*, *guṇa* of the verbal stem vowel would have been prevented by P. 1.1.5. This, however, is not desired. The present rule allows *guṇa* to take place.

5. At the end of the commentary on P. 1.2.18 the *KV* quotes two *ślokas* from Patañjali's *bhāṣya* here (*Mbh.* I, p. 200, lines 21–24). The question raised by the *ślokakāra* is, why in P. 1.2.18 the *anubandha K* has been mentioned in *Ktvā*. The question is somewhat surprising, because in the *sūtrapāṭha* the suffix *tvā* is everywhere mentioned as *Ktvā*. On the other hand, in the case of *uṇādi* suffixes the *anubandha K* may not be mentioned, as in P. 7.2.9. In the course of a difficult argument the *ślokakāra* justifies the presence of the *K* in *Ktvā* in P. 1.2.18. Patañjali agrees. See further the observations made in connection with P. 1.2.9, under 5.

1.2.19 NIṢṬHĀ ŚĪṄSVIDIMIDIKṢVIDIDHṚṢAH '(when added) after the verbal bases *śī–* " to lie down ", *svid–* " to sweat ", *mid–* " to grow fat ", *kṣvid–* " to ooze " and *dhṛṣ–* " to offend " (the suffixes called) *niṣṭhā* (when taking the augment *iṬ* are not regarded as marked with *K*) '.

1. This is an extension of the prohibition stated by P. 1.2.18.

2. The *uddeśya* is *niṣṭhā seṭ śī...dhṛṣaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *na kit*. The word *Ktvā* from P. 1.2.18 is cancelled by the incompatible item *niṣṭhā śī... dhṛṣaḥ*. The words *na seṭ* are continued from P. 1.2.18, as is the word *kit* from P. 1.2.5.

Although the mention of *Ktvā* is cancelled by that of *niṣṭhā*, this does not imply that the qualifier *seṭ* of *Ktvā* is also cancelled. In fact, *seṭ* being compatible with *niṣṭhā* is continued. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 5.

3. The term *niṣṭhā* is defined by P. 1.1.26 as referring to the suffixes *kta* and *KtavatU*.

4. The purpose of the rule is to allow *guṇa* of the verbal stem vowel by P. 7.3.84 or 86 in the cases mentioned, which would otherwise have been prohibited by P. 1.1.5.

5. One of the examples offered by the *KV* is *śayitaḥ* ' who has started to lie down ' (sg. nom. masc.). The derivation is as follows :

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(1) *śīṄ–*		*Dhātup.* 2.22
(2) *śī*	+ *Kta*	P. 3.2.102
(3) *śī*	+ *ta* + *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(4) *śī* + *iṬ*	+ *ta* + *s*	P. 7.2.35
(5) *śe* + *i*	+ *ta* + *s*	P. 7.3.84
(6) *śay* + *i*	+ *ta* + *s*	P. 6.1.78
(7) *śay* + *i*	+ *ta* + *rU*	P. 8.2.66
(8) *śay* + *i*	+ *ta* + *ḥ*	P. 8.3.15
śayitaḥ.		

Here *guṇa* which is desired and applied in stage (5) is made possible by the present rule.

6. At the end of its commentary the *KV* refers to P. 7.2.17. This rule says that the suffixes called *niṣṭhā* when added after verbal bases marked with *Ā*, and when denoting the sense of impersonal action or that of the beginning of an action take the augment *iṬ* as the less preferred option. With the exception of *śī–*, all bases mentioned in P. 1.2.19 are marked with *Ā* in the *Dhātup.* Accordingly, the *niṣṭhā* suffixes when added after these bases and when conveying the meanings indicated may or may not be *seṭ*. When they are, they come within the jurisdiction of P. 1.2.19. In the derivation of *aniṭ* forms like *śvinna* 'who has started to sweat' P. 8.2.42 is applied.

1.2.20 MṚṢAS TITIKṢĀYĀM '(when added) after (the verbal base) *mṛṣ–* in the sense of "to bear with" (the suffixes called *niṣṭhā*, when taking the augment *iṬ*, are not regarded as marked with *K*)'.

1. This is another extension of the prohibition stated by P. 1.2.18.

2. The mention of *mṛṣas titikṣāyām* cancels that of *śī...dhṛṣaḥ* from P. 1.2.19. The word *niṣṭhā* is continued from P. 1.2.19. The words *na seṭ* are continued from P. 1.2.18, whereas *kit* is continued from P. 1.2.5.

The *uddeśya* is *niṣṭhā mṛṣas titikṣāyām seṭ*. The *vidheya* is *na kit*.

3. Why doesn't P. 1.2.20 form one single rule with P. 1.2.19? The answer is that the verbal base mentioned in P. 1.2.20 has been provided with a special meaning condition which does not hold for the bases mentioned in P. 1.2.19.

4. The purpose of the rule is to allow *guṇa* of the verbal stem vowel by P. 7.3.86, which would otherwise have been prohibited by P. 1.1.5.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. One of the examples offered by the *KV* is *marṣitaḥ* 'forgiven' (sg. nom. masc.). For the derivation compare P. 1.2.19, under 5, *śayitaḥ*. In addition apply P. 1.1.51 for the *guṇa* vowel *a*.

6. The counter-example offered by the *KV* is *apamṛṣitam vākyam āha*, where *apamṛṣitam* is explained by the *Nyāsa* as *aparāmṛṣitam* : 'he spoke ill-considered words'.

1.2.21 UDUPADHĀD BHĀVĀDIKARMAṆOR ANYATARASYĀM '(when added) after (a verbal base) having penultimate *u* (and) when conveying the sense of *bhāva* "impersonal action" or of *ādikarman* "the beginning of an action" (the suffixes called *niṣṭhā*, when taking the augment *iṬ*, are) indifferently (regarded as not marked with *K*)'.

1. The prohibition of *Kittva* stated by P. 1.2.18 and extended by P. 1.2.19–20 is made optional by the present rule for the cases mentioned and on the conditions mentioned.

2. The words *kit* (P. 1.2.5), *seṭ na* (P. 1.2.18) and *niṣṭhā* (P. 1.2.19) are continued, because there is nothing to cancel them. The mention of *mṛṣas titikṣāyām* from 1.2.20 is cancelled by the incompatible item *udupadhāt*.

Hasn't the negative particle *na* been cancelled by the option word *anyatarasyām ?* According to Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 116, the particle *na* is continued in rules containing option terms. Also, according to Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 86, option terms are not continued in a following rule which contains *na*.

We have to distinguish carefully between two cases, (A) the preceding rule contains an option term, whereas a following rule contains *na*, and (B) the preceding rule contains *na*, whereas a following rule contains an option term. In the case of (A) *na* cancels the option. In the case of (B) a prohibition is made optional. That is to say, it may be applied, or it may not be.

P. 1.2.21 is clearly a (B) case. The preceding rule containing *na* is P. 1.2.18. The following rule containing an option term is P. 1.2.21. Thereby the prohibition (*na kit*) stated by P. 1.2.18 is made optional by P. 1.2.21. It may be applied, or it may not be applied. In this case, the option is without preference for one way or the other, or, in other words, the option is indifferent.

3. The locative word *bhāvādikarmaṇoḥ* stands for a meaning condition.

4. The word *ādikarman* is a *kdh.* cp. According to the *Nyāsa* on the *KV* on the present rule, it is to be explained as *ādibhūtakriyākṣaṇaḥ* 'the moment of the action which is (its) beginning'. The word *niṣṭhā* literally

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

means 'completion'. The suffixes *Kta* and *KtavatU* are often used to indicate the completion of an action. But sometimes they are used not to indicate a completed action, but its opposite, namely, a beginning or an ongoing action.

5. The word *anyatarasyām* is used in the *A.* to indicate stylistic non-preference. See Kiparski 1979, p. 1. Thus whether we don't apply *guṇa* to the verbal base vowel, or whether we do, in the cases and on the conditions mentioned in P. 1.2.21 is a matter of indifference.

6. The purpose of the rule is to allow *guṇa* of the verbal stem vowel by P. 7.3.86 which would otherwise have been prohibited by P. 1.1.5.

7. One of the examples for the sense of *bhāva* 'impersonal action' offered by the *KV* is *dyutitam|dyotitam anena* 'it has been shone by him', that is, he shines. The derivation of *dyutitam* is as follows :

(1)	*dyutA–*				*Dhātup.* 1.777
(2)	*dyut*	+ *Kta*			P. 3.2.102; 3.4.70
(3)	*dyut*	+	*ta*	+ *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(4)	*dyut* + *iṬ*	+	*ta*	+ *s*	P. 7.2.35
(5)	*dyut* + *i*	+	*ta*	+ *am*	P. 3.3.114; 7.1.24
(6)	*dyut* + *i*	+	*tam*		P. 6.1.107
	dyutitam.				

In stage (5) *guṇa* has not been applied, in accordance with the option left by the present rule. If *guṇa* had been applied, by P. 7.3.86, the resulting form would have been *dyotitam*, which is equally desired.

8. As the counter-example for the meaning condition *bhāvādikarmaṇoḥ* the *KV* offers *rucitaṃ kārṣāpaṇaṃ dadāti* 'he gives a shining (silver) coin'. The point is that in *rucitam* the suffix *Kta* has been added in the sense of agent, by P. 3.4.72.

9. At the end of its commentary the *KV* refers to *Vt.*I on the present rule. The *Vt.* proposes to add the word *śapaḥ* 'after (the *vikaraṇa*) *ŚaP*' to the present rule. Thus the operation prescribed by P. 1.2.21 becomes limited to those verbal bases which show a penultimate *u* and which take *ŚaP*. Therefore the option stated by P. 1.2.21 becomes a *vyavasthitavibhāṣā* 'limited option', limited, that is, to the verbal bases of the first, sixth and tenth conjugation.

1.2.22 (a) PŪṆAḤ '(when added) after (the verbal base) *pūṆ–* "to purify" (the suffixes called *niṣṭhā*, when taking the augment *iṬ* and when conveying

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

the sense of *bhāva* "impersonal action" or of *ādikarman* "the beginning of an action" are not regarded as marked with *K*)'.

1. The rule translated here is not P. 1.2.22 in its traditional phrasing. We propose to divide P. 1.2.22 into two rules, as follows :

P. 1.2.22 (a) *pūṅaḥ*.

P. 1.2.22 (b) *ktvā ca*.

The reasons for the proposed division of the rule are three. First, the particle *ca* should not come after the second word in a *sūtra*. Secondly, the only function which can be reasonably assigned to *ca* here is that of boundary marker. Thirdly, by adopting the division proposed at least some of the difficulties raised by tradition in connection with P. 1.2.22 can be avoided.

2. Tradition, as represented by the *KV*, raises two difficulties with regard to P. 1.2.22 read as *pūṅaḥ ktvā ca*. The first is, how to discontinue the option term *anyatarasyām* from P. 1.2.21. The second is, why does P. 1.2.22 say *ktvā ca* ?

As regards the first difficulty, the argument of the *KV* is that a rule occurring between two rules when each of them state an option must be *nitya* 'invariably applicable'. The argument goes back to Patañjali, see Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 90, fn. 282. As the *Nyāsa* (in connection with the *KV* on P. 1.2.24) has it, *dvayor vibhāṣayor madhyavartitvān nityo' yam vidhiḥ syāt* 'since it occurs between two (expressions of option, let this rule (P. 1.2.24) be (regarded as) *nitya*'. Both P. 1.2.21 and 23 contain a term expressing optionality. Therefore P. 1.2.22 cannot be an optional rule. Consequently, the term *anyatarasyām* cannot be continued.

The second difficulty goes back to Kātyāyana, Vts I– III on the present rule. The argument involves three rules :

P. 1.2.18, which says that *Ktvā* when preceded by *iṬ* is not regarded as *Kit*. Therefore *guṇa* of the verbal stem vowel is allowed.

P. 7.2.11, which says that a suffix which is *Kit* does not take the augment *iṬ* when that suffix is added after a verbal base in *u*.

P. 7.2.51, which, according to the *KV*– there is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali–, says that *Ktvā* and the suffixes called *niṣṭhā* preferably (*vā*, P. 7.2.41) take the augment *iṬ*, when added after *pūṄ*–.

Kātyāyana's solution is to rule out P. 7.2.11, because it does not deal with *pūṄ*– specifically (*Vt.* III on P. 1.2.22). Then, by P. 7.2.51, we have an

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

option. The preferred forms take *iṬ*. Once *iṬ* is added, the suffixes mentioned will be regarded as non–*Kit* by P. 1.2.18. Therefore *guṇa* of the verbal stem vowel by P. 7.3.84 is allowed. That gives us the forms *pavitvā* and *pavitaḥ*. On the other hand, if *iṬ* is not added, the suffixes mentioned will be regarded as *Kit*. Therefore *guṇa* of the verbal stem vowel by P. 7.3.84 is not allowed, by P. 1.1.5. That gives us the forms *pūtvā* and *pūtaḥ*, as the less preferred forms.

We note, by the way, that the *KV*, while commenting on P. 7.2.51, has discontinued the word *na* from P. 7.2.39. That makes all the difference with respect to the question whether we should regard *pūtvā* and *pūtaḥ* as the less preferred forms. See beneath.

At the end of his *bhāṣya* on P. 1.2.22 Patañjali mentions an opinion which he attributes to the *Bhāradvajīyas* (*Mbh*. I, p. 201, line 16). It says *nityam·akittvam iḍādyoḥ ktvāgrahaṇam uttarārtham* 'the two (suffixes *Kta* and *KtavatU*), when beginning with (the augment) *iṬ* are invariably regarded as non–*Kit*; the mention of *Ktvā* (in P. 1.2.22) is for the sake of the following rules (P. 1.2.23–26). This statement is quoted by the *KV* on P. 1.2.22. Thus, according to the *Bhāradvājīyas*, the mention of the *anuvṛtti* item *niṣṭhā* in P. 1.2.22 and that of *Ktvā* in the same rule have two different purposes. Whereas the mention of *niṣṭhā* serves to establish the non–*Kit*–status of *Kta* and *KtavatU*, that of *Ktvā* is not concerned with *akittva* at all. It only serves to make the *anuvṛtti* of *ktvā* possible in the next two rules. The reason must be that the *Ktvā*–form intended is already taken care of by P. 1.2.18 and P. 7.1.51.

We note that the name of *Bhāradvāja* has been mentioned in P. 7.2.63.

Against the first argument put forward by tradition it may be observed that the option terms *anyatarasyām* and *vā* in the *A*. convey different meanings. See Kiparski 1979, p. 1–4. They are not interchangeable items, as thought by tradition. Therefore the presence of *vā* in P. 1.2.23 is required, even if the term *anyatarasyām* would be continued in P. 1.2.22. Consequently, the argument put forward by tradition here cannot be accepted. See also Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 90. If the word *anyatarasyām* in P. 1.2.22 in its traditional phrasing is to be discontinued, it must have a different reason.

But what about the discontinuation of *anyatarasyām* in P. 1.2.22 (a) ? Here we note that Pāṇini chose to phrase two separate rules, P. 1.2.21 and 22 (a). Suppose he had wished to continue *anyatarasyām* in 22 (a). In that case he could have phrased one single rule, *pūṅudupadhād bhāvādikarmaṇor*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

anyatarasyām '(when added) after (the verbal base) *pūṄ*– or after (verbal bases) having prefinal *u* (the suffixes called *niṣṭhā*, when taking the augment *iṬ* and when conveying the sense of *bhāva* or *ādikarman* are) indifferently (not regarded as marked with *K*)'. The fact that Pāṇini did not do so gives us the clue that *anyatarasyām* is not continued in P. 1.2.22 (a).

The second argument put forward by tradition is correct. As a prescription P. 1.2.22 is redundant, because we can manage to derive the form intended (*pavitvā* 'after having purified') by P. 1.2.18 and P. 7.2.51. According to P. 7.2.51, where both *na* (P. 7.2.39) and *vā* (P. 7.2.41) are contiuned –against the *KV* which only continues *vā*–, the preferred form is *pūtvā*. See Kiparski 1979, p. 150. The only purposes to be atributed to the mention of *Ktvā* in P. 1.2.22 in its traditional phrasing are the discontinuation of the term *niṣṭhā* (from P. 1.2.19) and the continuation of the term *Ktvā* in P. 1.2.23–26.

Then what are the advantages in dividing the rule P. 1.2.22 as proposed above, and what are the consequences ? The advantages are, first, that a clear purpose has been assigned to the particle *ca* in what has become P. 1.2.22 (b), namely, that of boundary marker with respect to the preceding rule, P. 1.2.22 (a). In the second place, a clear reason can be provided for the discontinuation of the term *anyatarasyām* in P. 1.2.22 (a).

The consequences are also two. In the first place, P. 1.2.22 (a) continues to deal with the suffixes called *niṣṭhā* in the sense of *bhāva* and *ādikarman*. Secondly, the prohibition of *kittva*, which was made optional by P. 1.2.21, is enforced by P. 1.2.22 (a). That gives us the forms *pavitam*, *pavitaḥ* and *pavitavān* only in the meanings indicated. However, from P. 7.2.51 we understand that, in connection with *pū*–, the suffixes called *niṣṭhā* take the augment *iṬ* optionally (*na*, P. 7.2.39; *vā*, P. 7.2.41), that is, preferably not. That is how the forms *pūtam*, *pūtaḥ* and *pūtavān* may also be derived, as the preferred forms.

3. The term *kit* is continued from P. 1.2.5. The words *seṭ na* are continued from P. 1.2.18. The word *niṣṭhā* is continued from P. 1.2.19. The condition *bhāvādikarmaṇoḥ* is continued from P. 1.2.21, because there is nothing to cancel it. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 163. Obviously, since P. 1.2.22 in its traditional phrasing deals with *ktvā*, the *KV* does not continue the word *bhāvādikarmaṇoḥ* here. But in the newly proposed rule P. 1.2.22 (a) it must continue. For the discontinuation of the option term *anyatarasyām* see under 2.

The *uddeśya* is *pūṅaḥ bhāvādikarmaṇoḥ niṣṭhā seṭ*. The *vidheya* is *na kit*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

4. The verbal base *pūṄ*– is mentioned in the *Dhātup.* 1.1015 as *pūṄ pavane* '*pū*– in the sense of " to purify " '.

5. The purpose of the rule is to allow *guṇa* of the verbal stem vowel by P. 7.3.84 which would otherwise have been prohibited by P. 1.1.5.

6. The form *pavita* is rarely attested in Vedic literature. It occurs in the *Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa* 78.5.5 and in the *Taitt. Brāhm.* 1.8.5.5 and 1.8.6.4.

1.2.22 (b) KTVĀ CA 'also (when added after the verbal base *pūṄ*– " to purify ", the suffix) *Ktvā* (when taking the augment *iṬ* is not regarded as marked with *K*) '.

1. For the proposed division of P. 1.2.22 see P. 1.2.22 (a), under 1.

2. The particle *ca* in the rule read as *ktvā ca* serves as a boundary marker with regard to P. 1.2.22 (a).

3. The word *pūṅaḥ* is continued from P. 1.2.22 (a). The words *seṭ na* are continued from P. 1.2.18. The word *kit* is continued from P. 1.2.5. The word *niṣṭhā* from P. 1.2.19 is cancelled by the incompatible item *ktvā*. The meaning condition *bhāvādikarmaṇoḥ* phrased as a *dvandva* cp. is cancelled on the basis of *sāmarthya*, because *Ktvā* does not convey both of these meanings. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 45–46. For the discontinuation of the option term *anyatarasyām* see P. 1.2.22 (a), under 2.

The *uddeśya* is *pūṅaḥ ktvā seṭ*. The *vidheya* is *na kit*.

4. As stated under P. 1.2.22 (a), note 2, the rule *ktvā ca* as a prescription is redundant, because the form envisaged can be had from P. 1.2.18 in combination with P. 7.2.51. The purposes of the mention of *ktvā* lie in the discontinuation of the word *niṣṭhā* and in the continuation of *ktvā* in P. 1.2.23–26. As the *Bhāradvājīyas* quoted by Patañjali have it, the mention of *ktvā* is *uttarārtham* 'for the sake of the following (four rules) '. See again P. 1.2.22 (a), under 2.

5. The *ktvā* form envisaged is *pavitvā*. Here *guṇa* of the verbal base vowel applicable by P. 7.3.84 is allowed because of the prohibition of *Kittva*. Because of the option regarding the augment *iṬ* provided by P. 7.2.51 we may derive the form *pūtvā* also, as the less preferred form.

1.2.23 NOPADHĀTTHAPHĀNTĀDVĀ '(The suffix *Ktvā*, when taking the augment *iṬ*, and when added) after (a verbal base) having a prefinal *n* (and) ending in *th* or in *ph* (is) preferably (not regarded as marked with *K*) '.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1. The prohibition of *Kittva* stated by P. 1.2.18 and extended by P. 1.2.19-20 is made optional by the present rule for the cases mentioned.

2. The words *kit* (P. 1.2.5), *seṭ na* (P. 1.2.18) and *ktvā* (P. 1.2.22 (b)) are continued. The word *pūṅaḥ* from P. 1.2.22 (a) is cancelled by the incompatible item *nopadhāt thaphāntāt.*

The *uddeśyā* is *ktvā nopadhāt thaphāntāt seṭ.* The *vidheya* is *kit na vā.*

3. By the word *vā* in P. 1.2.23 the prohibition stated by *na* in P. 1.2.18 is made optional in the sense that the prohibition is the preferred option. The point is that both positive injunctions and prohibitions can be made optional by adding the terms *vā*, *vibhāṣā* or *anyatarasyām.* Between positive injunctions provided with an option term and prohibitions provided with an option term certain equivalences hold. Thus, in a context of prohibition, saying 'preferably not' (*na vā*) amounts to saying 'marginally' (*vibhāṣā*) in a context of positive injunctions.

Kiparski 1979, p. 89, when discussing the sequence P. 1.2.23–26, silently discontinues the prohibition *na* from P. 1.2.18 and consequently deals with these rules as positive injunctions made optional by the term *vā.* This leads him to speak of Pāṇini's preference for *Kittva* in the cases mentioned. In fact, however, Pāṇini's preference is for *akittva.* Accordingly, as will be explained later on, the preferred forms do not show deletion of the prefinal *n.* If classical Sanskrit shows preference for the forms without prefinal *n*, this must be due to a misinterpretation of Pāṇini's rule.

4. The word *vā* (like *vibhāṣā* and *saṃjñāyām*) occurs either at the end of a rule or at the beginning. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 244. Then should *vā* come at the end of P. 1.2.23 or at the beginning of P. 1.2.24 ? Considering that P. 1.2.24 already contains the particle *ca* as a boundary marker and that the words *ca* and *vā* never occur together in a rule, we conclude that *vā* should come at the end of P. 1.2.23.

5. We note that the features identifying the verbal bases meant in the present rule have been stated by two ablative forms, *nopadhāt thaphāntāt*, which each of them qualify the implied word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base'. Here reference is not to three types of verbal bases, one having prefinal *n*, one ending in *th* and one ending in *ph*, but to two types. If three types had been intended Pāṇini would have used the single cp. *nopadhathaphāntāt.* But, according to the phrasing chosen, the features stated by the dvandva cp. *thaphāntāt* are. each of them, to be applied in conjunction with the feature

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

stated by *nopadhāt*. Thus reference is to verbal bases having prefinal *n* and ending in *th*, and to verbal bases having prefinal *n* and ending in *ph*.

6. Why does the rule say *thapha-antāt*, whereas we could have that meaning from simply saying *thaphāt* and by applying the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72) ? According to the *Nyāsa* on the *KV* here, the rule has been phrased as it is to give us a clue, namely, that in the section dealing with the suffix *Ktvā* the *tadantavidhi* is not automatically applied. The explanation seems farfetched. Actually, the form *thapha-antāt* may have been chosen for the sake of clarity, because the word *dhātoḥ* which it qualifies is implied only.

7. The purpose of the rule is to allow an option regarding the prohibition of *Kittva* stated by P. 1.2.18. Thereby the deletion of the prefinal *n* prescribed by P. 6.4.24 and which is conditioned by the expression *kniti* becomes optional too. In fact, by P. 1.2.23 this deletion is declared to be the less preferred option. Consequently, the forms showing prefinal *n* are the preferred forms. See under 3.

8. One of the examples offered by the *KV* is *grathitvā*/*granthitvā* ' having tied together '. Here the less preferred form is *grathitvā*. It is derived as follows :

(1) *granthA-*		*Dhātup.* 9.41
(2) *granth*	+ *Ktvā*	P. 3.4.21
(3) *granth* + *iṬ*	+ *tvā*	P. 7.2.35
(4) *gra°th* + *i*	+ *tvā*	P. 6.4.24
grathitvā.		

For the deletion of the prefinal *n* in stage (4) see under 7.

9. The form *mathitvā* is attested in the *Taitt. Saṃh.* 5.1.9.3; *Maitrā. Saṃh.* 2.1.3; *Kāṭhaka Saṃh.* 6.6; *Śatap. Brahm.* 2.1.4.8; 2.5.2.19; *Taitt. Brāhm.* 1.1.9.10; *Āśvalāyana Śrautasūtra* 2.2.1; *Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra* 16.1.7. The form *grathittvā* occurs in the *Rudrajābāla Up.* 1.23 and in the *Jaiminīya Gṛhyasūtra* 1.5.5.

10. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the *sūtras* P. 1.2.23–24.

1.2.24 VAÑCILUÑCYṚTAŚ CA ' also (the suffix *Ktvā*, when taking the augment *iṬ* and when added) after (the verbal bases) *vañc-* " to deceive ", *luñc-* " to pluck out " and *ṛt-* " to abhor " (is better not regarded as marked with °*K*) '.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1. The present rule extends the option stated by P. 1.2.23 regarding the prohibition by P. 1.2.18 to the suffix *Ktvā* in connection with the verbal bases mentioned.

2. The words *kit* (P. 1.2.5), *seṭ na* (P. 1.2.18) and *ktvā* (P. 1.2.22 (b)) are continued. The words *nopadhāt thaphāntāt* are cancelled by the incompatible item *vañciluñcyṛtaḥ*. The option term *vā* is continued, because the same *vidheya* continues. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 272, convention 24.

The *uddeśya* is *ktvā vañciluñcyṛtaḥ seṭ*. The *vidheya* is *kit na vā*.

3. The word *ṛt* in *vañciluñcyṛtaḥ* does not refer to a verbal base ending in short *ṛ*, but to the verbal base *ṛt–* itself, by *PN*, *pb*. 103.

4. The particle *ca* serves as a boundary marker with regard to P. 1.2.23. See P. 1.2.23, under 4.

5. For *na vā* in the present rule see P. 1.2.23, under 3.

6. The vowel *i* added to the verbal bases *vañc–* and *luñc–* represents the *kṛt*–suffix *iK* used to indicate quotation forms of verbal bases by *Vt*. II on P. 3.3.108, *ikśtipau dhātunirdeśe* '(the suffixes) *iK* and *ŚtiP* (are used) to indicate a verbal base '.

7. The purpose of the rule is to allow an option regarding the prohibition of *Kittva* stated by P. 1.2.18. Thereby the deletion of the prefinal *n* prescribed by P. 6.4.24 (in the case of *vañc–* and *luñc–*) and *guṇa* of the prefinal vowel prescribed by P. 7.3.86 (in the case of *ṛt–*), which are both of them conditioned by the expression *kniti*, become optional too. In fact, by P. 1.2.24 the deletion and the non–application of *guṇa* are declared to be the less preferred option. Consequently, the forms showing prefinal *n* and the *guṇated* forms are the preferred forms. Compare P. 1.2.23, under 7.

8. The examples offered by the *KV* are *vacitvā|vañcitvā*, *lucitvā|luñcitvā* 'after having plucked out' and *ṛtitvā|artitvā* 'after having abhorred'. As explained above, the second forms are the preferred ones.

9. The counterexample for the *anuvṛtti* item *seṭ* in the rule offered by the *KV* is *vaktvā* 'after having deceived'. The augment *iṬ* is made optional (*vā* 'preferably') by P. 7.2.56 in connection with verbal bases marked with short *U* in the *Dhātup*. The base *vañc–* is mentioned here (1.204) as *vañcU–*.

1.2.25 TṚṢIMṚṢIKṚŚEḤ KĀŚYAPASYA '(the suffix *ktvā*, when taking the augment *iṬ* and when added) after (the verbal bases) *tṛṣ–*" to be thirsty "

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

mṛṣ– " to bear with " and *kṛś*– " to make lean " (is better not regarded as marked with *K*, according to the opinion) of Kāśyapa '.

1. This *sūtra* extends the option stated by P. 1.2.23 regarding the prohibition by P. 1.2.18 to the suffix *ktvā* in connection with the verbal bases mentioned.

2. The words *kit* (P. 1.2.5), *seṭ na* (P. 1.2.18) and *ktvā* (P. 1.2.22 (b)) are continued. The item *vañciluñcyṛtaḥ* from P. 1.2.24 is cancelled by the incompatible item *tṛṣimṛṣikṛśeḥ*. The option term *vā* is continued, because the same *vidheya* continues. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 272, convention 24.

The *uddeśya* is *ktvā tṛṣimṛṣikṛśeḥ seṭ*. The *vidheya* is *kit na vā*.

3. For *na vā* see P. 1.2.23, under 3.

4. For the vowel *i* added after *tṛṣ*–, etc. see P. 1.2.23, under 5.

5. The *Nyāsa* explains the meanings of the verbal bases mentioned as *Ñitṛṣ A pipāsāyām* ' *tṛṣ*– in the sense of " to be thirsty " ', *mṛṣ A titikṣāyām* ' *mṛṣ*–in the sense of " to bear with " ', and *kṛś A tanūkaraṇe* ' *kṛś*–in the sense of " to make lean " '.

6. Kāśyapa is the name of a prepāṇinian grammarian of whom nothing else is known. The *KV*, following Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 201, line 21), says that Kāśyapa's name has been mentioned to show reverence. The idea is that the purpose of the mention of the name is not to establish optionality, because the word *vā* is already available from P. 1.2.23.

Strictly speaking, the name is mentioned, because in connection with *ktvā* and the verbal bases mentioned Kāśyapa's opinion is that of *kit na vā*. We conclude that, according to other grammarians, *ktvā*, when taking *iṬ* and when added after the verbal bases mentioned, is *kit* only. Therefore forms showing *guṇa* of the verbal base vowel are not allowed.

We note that names of grammarians are always put at the end of a rule.

7. The purpose of the rule is to allow an option regarding the prohibition of *Kittva* stated by P. 1.2.18. Thereby *guṇa* of the prefinal vowel prescribed by P. 7.3.86, which is conditioned by the expression *kniti*, becomes optional too. In fact, the forms showing *guṇa* of the prefianl vowel become the preferred forms. Compare P. 1.2.23, under 7, and P. 1.2.24, under 6.

8. The examples offered by the *KV* are *tṛṣitvā*|*tarṣitvā* ' after having been thirsty ', *mṛṣitvā*|*marṣitvā* ' after having borne with ' and *kṛśitvā*|*karśitvā*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

'after having made lean'. As explained above, the second forms are the preferred ones.

1.2.26 (a) RALO VYUPADHĀD DHALĀDEḤ '(the suffix *Ktvā*, when taking the augment *iṬ* and when added) after (a verbal base which ends in a *raL*-letter (and) has prefinal *u* (short or long) or *i* (short or long) (and) which begins with a consonant (is better not regarded as marked with *K*)'.

1. The rule translated here is not P. 1.2.26 in its traditional phrasing. We propose to divide this rule into two rules, as follows :

P. 1.2.26 (a) *ralo vyupadhād dhalādeḥ.*

P. 1.2.26 (b) *saṃś ca.*

The reason for this division of the text is the function assigned to the particle *ca*, namely, that of boundary marker. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 244.

2. The (a) rule extends the option stated by P. 1.2.23 regarding the prohibition by P. 1.2.18 to the suffix *Ktvā* in connection with the verbal bases mentioned.

3. The words *kit* (P. 1.2.5), *seṭ na* (P. 1.2.18) and *ktvā* (P. 1.2.22 (b)) are continued. The word *tṛṣimṛṣikṛśeḥ* from P. 1.2.25 is cancelled by the incompatible item *ralaḥ vyupadhāt halādeḥ*. The option term *vā* is continued, because the same *vidheya* continues. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 272 convention 24.

The *uddeśya* is *ktvā ralaḥ vyupadhāt halādeḥ seṭ*. The *vidheya* is *kit na vā*.

4. The translation of the rule has been stated in accordance with accepted principles of *anuvṛtti*. But here the difficulty starts. Whereas in its comment on P. 1.2.25 the *KV* continues the word *na* from P. 1.2.18, it does not do so with regard to P. 1.2.26. Apparently, the question whether P. 1.2.26 prescribes or prohibits *Kittva* in connection with *Ktvā* and *saN* goes back to Kātyāyana. In *Vt.* I on the present rule he says that here *Kittva* is prescribed. No mention of option is made. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 202, line 7) explains that the *akittva* applicable to *ktvā* by P. 1.2.18 is blocked by P. 1.2.26. The reason why the word *na* should not be continued in P. 1.2.26 is not stated.

The consequence is that, according to traditional opinion, the non-guṇated forms will be the correct ones. If, however, the word *na* is continued in P. 1.2.26 (a), the guṇated forms will be the preferred ones.

It can, of course, hardly be denied that Kātyāyana and Patañjali are *lakṣyaikacakṣuṣka* 'guided exclusively by the examples from language'. In

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

fact, those Vedic examples which are available here show a marked preference for non-guṇated forms. Therefore it appears that we shall have to discontinue the word *na* in P. 1.2.26 (a), not by any accepted standards of *anuvṛtti*, but on the basis of examples and Kātyāyana's explicit statement.

5. For *na vā* see P. 1.2.23, under 3.

6. The form *vy* in *vyupadhāt* is the sandhi-form of a *dvandva* cp. explained by the *KV* as *uś ca iś ca*, resulting in the form *vī*.

The *pratyāhāra iṆ* formed with the first *anubandha Ṇ* in the *Śivasūtras* and comprising the vowels *i* and *u* is not used in the *A*. The *pratyāhāra iṆ* is always formed with the second *Ṇ* in the *Śivasūtras* and then includes all vowels, semivowels and *h*.

7. In defining the verbal bases intended Pāṇini uses three ablative forms each of which qualifies the implied word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base'. Here the second ablative form contains a *dvandva* cp. consisting of two members, *u* and *i*. Reference is not to four types of verbal bases, one ending in a *raL*-letter, one having prefinal *u*, one having prefinal *i*, and one beginning with a consonant, but to two types only. The constituents of the *dvandva* cp. are, each of them, to be applied in conjunction with the features stated by the two other ablative forms. Thus reference is to verbal bases having prefinal *u*, ending in a *raL*-letter and beginning with a consonant on the one hand, and to verbal bases having prefinal *i*, ending in a *raL*-letter and beginning with a consonant, on the other hand. Compare P. 1.2.23, under 5.

8. The form *ralaḥ*, which qualifies the implied word *dhātoḥ*, is to be interpreted with the help of the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72). Thus *ralaḥ* is taken to mean *ralantād* 'after (a verbal base) ending in a *raL*-letter'.

The form *raL* itself is a *pratyāhāra* 'abbreviative designation' which stands for all consonants except *y* and *v*.

9. The purpose of the rule is to allow an option regarding the prohibition of *Kittva* stated by P. 1.2.18. Thereby *guṇa* of the prefinal vowel prescribed by P. 7.3.86, which is conditioned by the expression *kniti*, becomes optional too. But see the observations made under 4.

10. The examples offered by the *KV* are *dyutitvā/dyotitvā* 'after having shone', and *likhitvā/lekhitvā* 'after having written'. As stated under 4, according to tradition, the first (non-guṇated) forms are the preferred ones.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

According to the rule as tranlated above, the second (guṇated) forms are the preferred ones.

1.2.26 (b) SAṂŚ CA 'also (the desiderative suffix) *saN* (when taking the augment *iṬ* and when added after a verbal base which ends in a *raL*-letter (and) which has pre-final *u* (short or long) or *i* (short or long) (and) which begins with a consonant is better not regarded as marked with *K*) '.

1. For the division of the original rule P. 1.2.26 see P. 1.2.26 (a), under 1.

2. The particle *ca* marks the boundary with regard to P. 1.2.26 (a). See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 244.

3. The suffix *saN* is preferably (*vā*) added after a verbal base to express the sense of *icchā* 'wish' by P. 3.1.7. The augment *iṬ* is regularly added to *saN* by P. 7.2.35.

4. The examples offered by the *KV* are *didyutiṣate*|*didyotiṣate* 'he wishes to shine', and *lilikhiṣati*|*lilikheṣati* 'he wishes to write'. Here, according to the interpretation of the present rule given, the second (guṇated) forms are the preferred ones, depending on the *anuvṛtti* of the word *na* in the rule. See further P. 1.2.26 (a), under 4.

The derivation of *didyutiṣate* is as follows :

(1)		*dyutA–*						*Dhātup.* 1.777
(2)		+ *dyut*		+ *saN*				P. 3.1.7
(3)		+ *dyut*	+ *iṬ*	+ *sa*				P. 7.2.35
(4)	*dyut*	+ *dyut*	+ *i*	+ *sa*				P. 6.1.9
(5)	*diut*	+ *dyut*	+ *i*	+ *sa*				P. 7.4.67
(6)	*dit*	+ *dyut*	+ *i*	+ *sa*				P. 6.1.108
(7)	*di*	+ *dyut*	+ *i*	+ *sa*				P. 7.4.60
(8)	*di*	+ *dyut*	+ *i*	+ *sa*			+ *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(9)	*di*	+ *dyut*	+ *i*	+ *sa*			+ *ta*	P. 3.4.78
(10)	*di*	+ *dyut*	+ *i*	+ *sa*			+ *te*	P. 3.4.79
(11)	*di*	+ *dyut*	+ *i*	+ *sa*	+ *ŚaP*		+ *te*	P. 3.1.68
(12)	*di*	+ *dyut*	+ *i*	+ *sa*			+ *te*	P. 6.1.97
(13)	*di*	+ *dyut*	+ *i*	+ *ṣa*			+ *te*	P. 8.3.57

didyutiṣate.

In this derivation the suffix *saN* is regarded as marked with *K*, which is the less preferred option. Therefore *guṇa* of the verbal stem vowel, applicable by P. 7.3.86, is blocked by P. 1.1.5.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.2.27 ŪKĀLO 'JJHRASVADĪRGHAPLUTAḤ 'a vowel whose duration is like that of *u*, or *ū*, or *ū* 3 (is called respectively) short, long or protracted'.

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra* which introduces and defines technical terms. The *saṃjñins* are *u*, *ū* and *ū*3, and come first. The *saṃjñās* are *hrasva*, *dīrgha* and *pluta*.

2. The correspondence of the *saṃjñins* and the *saṃjñās* is regulated by the *pb.* P. 1.3.10. This *pb.* tells us that the correspondence of terms enumerating an equal number of items in two sets is a one-to-one correspondence in the order of enumeration.

3. The *uddeśya* is *ūkālaḥ ac.* The *vidheya* is *hrasvadīrghaplutaḥ*. By the introduction of a new incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya* any *anuvṛtti* from the previous rules is blocked. See Joshi- Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. The *KV*, quoting *Vt.* IV on P. 1.2.28, says that the word *ac* in the rule is meant to exclude conjunct consonants. See further under 10. The term *ac* refers to any vowel, including its *savarṇa* 'homogeneous' varieties.

5. The constituent *ū* in *ūkālaḥ* is the sandhi-form of a *dvandva* cp. analysed in the sense of *uś ca ūś ca u3ś ca*. The form *ū* is arrived at by applying P. 6.1.101.

6. As pointed out by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 202, line 13), the word *ūkāla* is a cp. of the *uṣṭramukha* type which shows deletion (*lopa*) of the *uttarapada* 'final constituent' serving as the *upamāna* 'standard of comparison'. See *BDA*, Introduction, p. lii-liii. Thus the cp. is to be analysed in the sense of *ūkālaḥ iva kālaḥ asya* (*acaḥ*) '(that vowel) whose duration is like that of *u*, *ū* or *ū*3 '.

7. The *dvandva* cp. *hrasvadīrghaplutaḥ* has been stated in the sg. masc. Why not in the sg. ntr. (by P. 2.4.17), or in the pl. masc. ? The traditional answer is *sautratvāt* 'because (the statement) belongs to the genre called) *sūtra* '. As a matter of fact, Pāṇini may or may not apply his own rules to his statements about language, his meta-language. In the second place, considerations of ease of pronunciation or memorization, or even metrical considerations may play a role as far as the *Saṃhitāpāṭha* of Pāṇini's text is concerned. Compare, for instance, P. 8.2.39, *jhalāṃ jaśo 'nte*, and P. 8.4.53, *jhalāṃ jaś jhasi*. Here the first term is stated in the plural, the second in the sg., for no apparent reason.

8. Normally, whatever belongs to other sciences like phonetics is taken for granted by Pāṇini. Patañjali, in a well known passage (*Mbh.* I, p. 208,

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

lines 19–20) says, *vyākaraṇaṃ nāmeyam uttarā vidyā. so 'sau chandaḥśāstreṣv abhivinīta upalabdhyāvagantuṃ sahate'* grammar (as a subject of study) comes later. One who is well-trained in the treatises dealing with prosody (and phonetics) will be able to understand (the concepts introduced from these sciences) because he is (already) familiar (with them)'. Compare also *PASPA*, Bh. No. 44.

Then why does Pāṇini define the notions *hrasva*, etc.? We note that he does not do so in the case of the more complicated notions of *anusvāra* or *visarjanīya*. The reason is that Pāṇini requires the terms *hrasva*, etc. in his *upadeśa* system as a condition for grammatical operations. Compare, for instance, P. 6.1.176; P. 8.2.27.

9. Pāṇini does not define the concepts of *hrasva*, etc. in terms of absolute phonological duration. He merely defines relative duration. But according to the *KV*, *hrasva*, etc. stand for (*eka*)*mātrika*, *dvimātrika* and *trimātrika* vowels, that is, vowels counting one, two or three *morae*. See Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, paras, 76–78, and Allen 1953, p. 84–85.

10. In Sanskrit phonetic literature the *mātrā* concept has been applied to consonants also. Compare Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 43, lines, 24–25) '*āntaryato 'rdhamātrikasya vyañjanasya mātriko 'kāro bhaviṣyati*' because of articulatory proximity the sound *a* which counts one *mātrā* would come in the place of a consonant which counts half a *mātrā*'; and *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya* 1.37, *hrasvārdhakālaṃ vyañjanam* 'a consonant has half the duration of a short vowel'. See further Allen 1953, p. 84. Thus a conjunct consonant is considered to be *ekamātrika* 'counting one *mora*'. But if this is so, then why cannot the term *hrasva* be applied to such a conjunct consonant also? That is why the *KV* says that the word *ac* serves to block the application of the term *hrasva* to conjunct consonants. The example is *titaucchatram* 'the (whole of a) sieve and an umbrella'. The point is that the application of the augment *tUK* by P. 6.1.73 requires the preceding sound to be *hrasva*. That is to say, by the present rule the preceding sound must be a short vowel.

11. Why does the rule refer to the sound *ū* as the standard for deciding what is short, long and protracted? Nāgeśa, *Laghuśabdenduśekhara* on P. 1.2.27 says *kukkuṭarute ukāre ekadvitrimātratvaprasiddher akārādayo noktāḥ* 'because it is well known that the sound *u* in the crowing of a cock counts one, two or three *mātrās*, the sounds *a*, etc. have not been mentioned. For reference to other animals see Allen 1953, p. 84.

12. The whole section P. 1.2.27–40 deals with prosodic features, length and pitch of vowels.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.2.28 ACAŚ CA 'and (a vowel substitute prescribed as *hrasva* " short ". *dīrgha* " long " or *pluta* " protracted " comes) in the place of a vowel (only)'.

1. This is a *paribhāṣā*, a rule laying down a grammatical convention which is helpful in interpreting other rules. See P. 1.1.3, under 1.

2. P. 1.2.28 may be considered to be an associative digression in the sense that it introduces an incidental conjunctive process. The items conjoined are *hrasvadīrghaplutaḥ* from P. 1.2.27, and *acaḥ* in the present rule. See Joshi – Bhate 1984, p. 197.

3. Although the *KV* does not say so, the word *ac* from P. 1.2.27 is to be continued in P. 1.2.28, although, strictly speaking, it is redundant here. The reason is that the terms *hrasva* etc. can only refer to a vowel. Still, the *anuvṛtti* of *ac* is required for the sake of P. 1.2.29.

The word *ūkālaḥ* is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*, See Joshi – Bhate 1984, p. 45 – 46.

The *uddeśya* is *hrasvadīrghaplutaḥ ac*. The *vidheya* is *acaḥ*. We note that what was the *vidheya* in P. 1.2.27 has become the *uddeśya* in P. 1.2.28.

4. As stated by the *KV*, the present *paribhāṣā* serves to limit the *sthānin* 'original' (of the substitutes prescribed by *hrasva*, etc.). The *sthānin* can be a vowel only. Or, in other words, wherever an operation is prescribed with the help of the words *hrasva*, etc., we have to supply the word *acaḥ*.

5. The word *ca* serves as a boundary marker with regard to P. 1.2.27. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 244. Since no item similar to the genitive word *acaḥ* has been prescribed in the preceding rule P. 1.2.27, there is no point in translating *ca* by 'also'.

6. The genitive ending in *acaḥ* is used in its technical sense as prescribed by P. 1.1.49. Thus *acaḥ* is interpreted in the sense of *acaḥ sthāne* 'in the place of a vowel'.

7. By way of example the *KV* refers to P. 1.2.47. This rule prescribes the substitution of a *hrasva* item for (the final of) a neuter *prātipadika*. By P. 1.1.52, a substitute comes in the place of the final only of the item stated in the genitive case in a rule. The present rule makes it clear that the final envisaged must be a vowel.

8. The *KV* offers several counter examples for the word *acaḥ* in P. 1.2.28. One of them is the expression *suvāg brāhmaṇakulam* 'the eloquent community of brahmins'. If the restrictive term *acaḥ* had not been stated in the present

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

rule, then the substitute prescribed by the words *hrasva*, etc. would have come in the place of a final consonant also. Therefore P. 1.2.47 would also have become applicable to the final consonant of the neuter *prātipadika suvāc*. To show that *suvāc* is a neuter word, the word *brāhmaṇakulam* has been added. *Suvāc*, being a (*bv.*) cp. is called *prātipadika* by P. 1.2.46.

9. When shortening or lengthening is prescribed by the mere use of *a* or *ā*, the substitutes *a* or *ā* do not necessarily come in the place of a vowel. Consider, for instance, the derivation of the word *sas* 'he'. It goes as follows :

(1)	*tad* + *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(2)	*taa* + *s*	P. 7.2.104
(3)	*ta* + *s*	P. 6.1.97
(4)	*sa* + *s*	P. 7.2.106
	sas.	

In stage (2) two rules become applicable, P. 6.1.68, which prescribes the deletion of the nominative ending after a stem ending in a consonant, and P. 7.2.104, which prescribes the substitution of *a* for the stem-final *d*. This is a one-way conflict (see P. 1.1.57, under 8). Here the siddha-principle tells us to apply that rule first which destroys the *nimitta* 'cause' (of application) of the other rule. That is why in stage (2) we apply P. 7.2.104.

On the other hand, where shortening is prescribed by the use of the term *hrasva*, it must refer to a vowel. Consider, for instance, the derivation of the form *ninaya* 'he has led'. It goes as follows :

(1)	*ṆīÑ–*	*Dhātup.* 1.950
(2)	*nī*	P. 6.1.65
(3)	*nī* + *lIṬ*	P. 3.2.115
(4)	*nī* + *nī* + *lIṬ*	P. 6.1.8
(5)	*ni* + *nī* + *lIṬ*	P. 7.4.59
(6)	*ni* + *nī* + *tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(7)	*ni* + *nī* + *ṆaL*	P. 3.4.82
(8)	*ni* + *ne* + *a*	P. 7.2.115
(9)	*ni* + *nāy* + *a*	P. 6.1.78
	ninaya.	

The point is that the shortening applied in stage (5) in connection with the reduplication has been prescribed by the use of the term *hrasvaḥ*. Therefore it is applied to the reduplicative vowel only.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.2.29 UCCAIR UDĀTTAḤ 'a high-pitch (vowel is called) *udātta*'.

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* is *uccaiḥ* and comes first.

2. As stated by the *KV* following Patañjali, the word *ac* from P. 1.2.27 is continued. See P. 1.2.28, under 2. The word *acaḥ* from P. 1.2.28 is discontinued, because it belongs to an associative digression. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 273, convention 35.

The *uddeśya* is *uccaiḥ ac*. The *vidheya* is *udāttaḥ*.

3. The terms *udātta*, *anudātta* and *svarita* are known from phonetics. Then why does Pāṇini define them ? The reason is that they belong to Pāṇini's *upadeśa* system in which they serve as conditions for grammatical operations. One example is P. 8.2.5. Compare P. 1.2.27, under 8.

4. The word *uccaiḥ* is an adverb to be interpreted as *uccaiḥ uccāryamāṇaḥ* (*ac*) '(a vowel) being uttered in a high way (that is, with high pitch)'.

5. What is actually meant by *uccaiḥ* ? The explanation is best given under three headings : the *Taittirīya Prātiśakhya* (edition W. D. Whitney, New Haven 1871); Kātyāyana and Patañjali; and the *KV*.

A. The *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya* (*TP*)

According to *TP* 22.9, *āyāma* 'stretching', *dāruṇya* 'harshness' and *aṇutā khasya* ' smallness of the throat / larynx ' are the factors responsible for what is called *uccaiḥ*.

According to *TP* 23.4, *vāc* ' voice ' has seven *sthānas* ' states/conditions', *sthāna* being interpreted as *avasthāna*.

According to *TP* 23.5. among these *sthānas* are *mandra* ' deep, low ', *madhyama* ' middle, average ' and *tāra* ' high, loud '.

According to *TP* 23.10, the *mandra* type of voice is produced in the chest (*uras*), the *madhyama* type in the throat (*kaṇṭha*) and the (*tāra*) type in the head (*śiras*).

B. Kātyāyana and Patañjali

In *Vt.* I on P. 1.2.29 – 30 Kātyāyana says that we will have difficulties in applying the terms *udātta*, etc., because what is *ucca* ' high ' and what is *nīca* ' low ' is not fixed.

The examples given by Patañjali in his explanation of *Vt.* I are ambiguous. They may be taken to refer to loudness, but also to the pitch of

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

voice. Now the difficulty is that what appears to be *uçca* to one person may appear to be *nīca* to another. Therefore, in order to apply the terms *udātta*, etc. a definition of what is *ucca* and what is *nīca* is required.

The definition, that is, the defining characteristics, is taken from the *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya* 22.9. The features mentiond here are subsequently explained by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 207, lines 6 – 7). *Āyāma* is explained as *gātrāṇāṃ nigrahaḥ* 'tension of the organs'. Reference may be to the tension of the vocal cords in direction of their length. *Dāruṇya* is explained as *svarasya dāruṇatā* 'harshness of sound'. i. e., *rūkṣatā* 'shrillness'. *Aṇutā khasya* is explained as *kaṇṭhasya saṃvṛtatā* 'constriction of the throat'. Reference may be to a constriction of the opening of the glottis. Here two features are articulatory, whereas one (*rūkṣatā*) belongs to auditory phonetics.

In *Vt.* II on the same rules Kātyāyana offers his solution how to avoid the difficulties mentioned. The solution is to add the expression *samānaprakrame* to the rules in question.

Patañjali says that *samānaprakrame* is to be interpreted as *samāne prakrame* 'given a common *prakrama*'. He then asks the question : what, however, is *prakrama* ?' In answer he briefly refers to *uras* 'chest', *kaṇṭha* 'throat' and *śiras* 'head' (*Mbh.* I, p. 207, lines 13 – 14). That is all.

Since Patañjali took his defining characteristics of *ucca* and *nīca* from the *TP*, it seems at least possible that the reference to *uras*, etc. is also based on the *TP*. The relevant passages are *TP* 23.5 and 23.10, for which see under 5 A. The three *sthānas* mentioned here can easily be identified with three registers or ranges of voice, namely, bass and tenor and what lies in between.

Assuming that this is correct, and that Patañjali's explanation of Kātyāyana's *prakrama* is correct, the translation of *samāne prakrame* can only be 'given a common register of voice' in the sense indicated above. Then how does this remove the difficulty pointed out by Kātyāyana in *Vt.* 1 ? It does so by relating *ucca* and *nīca* to the common pitch of voice.

We note that in the sense of 'in a given key' the *Atharvaveda Prātiśākhya* 1.14 uses the expression *samānayame*. The translation goes back to W. D. Whitney.

C. The *KV*.

The commentary of the *KV* on P. 1.2.29 mainly consists of three passages. First it is stated that *uccaiḥ* is not to be taken in the sense of greater

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

loudness (*śrutiprakarṣa*). The following passage reads as follows: *sthānakṛtam uccatvaṃ saṃjñino viśeṣaṇam. Tālvādiṣu hi bhāgavatsu sthāneṣu varṇā niṣpadyante. Tatra yaḥ samāne sthāne ūrdhvabhāganiṣpanno 'c sa udāttasaṃjño bhavati ' uccatva* " the quality high ", which is caused by *sthāna* " the place of articulation ", (functions as) the qualifier of that which is named (*udātta*, namely, a vowel). Because speechsounds are produced in places of articulation, like the palate, etc., which have parts. This being so, given a common place of articulation, a vowel which has been produced in the upper portion (of the place of articulation concerned) is called *udātta* '.

The immediately following third passage then refers to the three features mentioned by Patañjali. It says that, when an *udātta*–vowel as defined earlier is uttered, *āyāma*, *rukṣatā* and *saṃvṛtatā kaṇṭhavivarasya* ' constriction of the opening of the throat ' occur. The word *āyāma* is explained as *nigraha* ' tension '. The word *rukṣatā* is explained as *asnigdhatā svarasya* ' lack of smoothness of sound '.

The following points may be noted here. In the first place, as stated by the *Nyāsa*, *uccatā* ' the quality high ' is taken as a kind of spatial dimension. In the second place, Kātyāyana's *prakrama* has become identified with *sthāna* in the sense of place of articulation in the mouth. Thus *samāne prakrame* is interpreted to mean *samāne sthāne* ' in a common place of articulation '. In the third place, in accordance with the idea of spatial dimension associated with *uccatā*, the *sthāna*, any *sthāna*, is divided into two portions, an upper part called *ūrdhvabhāga*, and a lower part called *nīcabhāga* (see the *KV* on P. 1.2.30). In the fourth place, the *ūrdhvabhāga* is declared to be responsible for the origination of the quality *uccaiḥ* of a vowel. Thus what the *KV* does here is to put forward a theory on the origination of pitch.

It is not known whether this theory originated with the authors of the *KV*, whether it was inserted by a revisor of the text of the *KV*, or whether it has been borrowed from earlier tradition. Thus the source of the theory is unknown. Kaiyaṭa, in his comment on *Bh.* No. 14 on P. 1.2.29 – 30, accepts it. Nāgeśa, in his comment here explains that the *udātta* accent originates from the contact of the airstream confined to the upper portion of the place of articulation. However, this may be, the theory is remarkably wrong. That is to say, it is based on a wrong analysis of what is pitch.

Having stated its theory, the *KV* then proceeds by saying that a vowel produced in the *ūrdhvabhāga* of a place of articulation in the mouth shows

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

the features mentioned by Patañjali. But this is impossible. Adopting the classic division of articulatory processes into *ābhyantara* 'intra-buccal' and *bāhya* 'extra-buccal' (Allen 1953, p. 22) we can identify two of Patañjali's features, namely, *āyāma* and *aṇutā khasya* as *bāhya*. Clearly, the *KV* tries to combine mutually contradictory positions.

6. For the accentuation of Vedic texts, a summary of traditional doctrine regarding accent, and a note on the replacement of pitch by stress see Wackernagel I, 1896, paras 243 – 254. Compare also Allen 1953, p. 91 – 92.

7. The examples offered by the *KV* are the plural pronominal forms *ye* '(those) who ', *te* 'those' and *ke* 'who ? '.

To explain the accent here, it is necessary to state the derivation. Our example is *te*. It is derived as follows :

(1) *tad* + *Jas*	P. 4.1.2
(2) *taa* + *as*	P. 7.2.102
(3) *ta* + *as*	P. 6.1.97
(4) *ta* + *Śī*	P. 7.1.17
(5) *te*	P. 6.1.87
te.	

In stage (1) the vowel of the *prātipadika tad* is *udātta*, by *Phiṭsūtra* 1 (see *SK*, *svaraprakaraṇa*, under *phiṭsūtrāṇi*), whereas the case ending *Jas* is *anudātta* by P. 3.1.4. In stage (2) the substitute vowel must be *anudātta*, by P. 6.1.158. In stage (3) the single substitute *a* is *udātta*, by P. 8.2.5. In stage (4) the substitute vowel *ī* is *anudātta*, by P. 1.1.56. In stage (5) the single substitute *e* is *udātta*, again by P. 8.2.5.

8. A more simple example is *bhávati* 'he/she/it becomes' derived as *bhū* + *ŚaP* + *tiP*. Here the vowel *ū* of the verbal base is *udātta* by P. 6.1.162. The replacement vowel *a* remains *udātta*, by P. 1.1.56. The two suffixes *ŚaP* and *tiP* are *anudātta*, by P. 3.1.4.

1.2.30 NĪCAIR ANUDĀTTAḤ 'a low-pitch (vowel is called) *anudātta* '.

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* is *nīcaiḥ* and comes first.

2. The word *ac* from P. 1.2.27 is continued, see P. 1.2.28, under 2. The words *nīcaiḥ* and *anudātta* cancel the incompatible items *uccaiḥ* and *udātta* from the previous rule.

The *uddeśya* is *nīcaiḥ ac*. The *vidheya* is *anudāttaḥ*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

3. The word *anudātta* is a *tp.* cp. formed by P. 2.2.6 in the literal sense of 'other than *udātta*'. It is accented on the first syllable by P. 6.2.2 (*avyaya*).

4. By P. 6.1.158 a *pada* 'finished word' is *anudātta* with the exception of one single vowel which is either *udātta* or *svarita*.

5. For the reason why Pāṇini has defined the notion of *anudātta* see P. 1.2.29, under 3. One example for the use of *anudātta* as a condition for a grammatical operation is P. 8.2.4.

6. In his *bhāṣya* on P. 1.2.29–30 (*Mbh.* I, p. 207, lines 8–10) Patañjali, following the *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya* 22.10, mentions three features of low pitch. They are *anvavasarga*, *mārdava* and *urutā khasya* and form the opposites of the features ascribed to *udātta*. The word *anvavasarga* is explained as *gātrāṇāṃ śithilatva* 'relaxation of the organs', presumably referring to the lax position of the vocal cords in direction of their length. The word *mārdava* is explained as *svarasya mṛdutā*, that is, *snigdhatā* 'smoothness of sound'. The expression *urutā khasya* is explained as *mahattā kaṇṭhasya* 'bigness of the (opening of the) throat', presumably referring to the glottis. Compare P. 1.2.29, under 5 B.

7. The *KV*, in its comment on the present rule, follows the pattern set by the comment on P. 1.2.29. It says that, given a common *sthāna* 'place of articulation' an *anudātta* vowel is produced in the lower portion (*nīcabhāga*) of the *sthāna*. When such a vowel is being uttered, it shows the features mentioned by Patañjali. The feature called *mahattā* is explained as *kaṇṭha-vivarasya urutā* 'wide opening of the throat (glottis)'. Compare P. 1.2.29, under 5 C.

8. The *KV* offers examples by first quoting *Phiṭsūtra* 78, in a modified form, adding *nema* 'someone', and subsequently mentioning the sentence *namas te rudra nīlakaṇṭha sahasrākṣa* 'honour to you, o Rudra, the blue-throated one, the thousand-eyed one', which also may be a quotation.

The stems *tva*, etc. are enumerated in the *sarvādigaṇa* (No. 241, 11-14 in Böhtlingk's edition). According to *Phiṭsūtra* 78, which does not mention *nema*, these stems are *anucca*, that is, *anudātta*. As regards the sentence the word *te* has been substituted for *tubhyam* by P. 8.1.22, as explained by the *Nyāsa*. It is *anudātta* by P. 8.1.18. The words *rudra*, *nīlakaṇṭha* and *sahasrākṣa* are vocatives by P. 2.3.48. This being so, they are *anudātta* by P. 8.1.72 and P. 8.1.19.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.2.31 SAMĀHĀRAḤ SVARITAḤ 'a combined pitch (vowel is called) *svarita*'.

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* is *samāhāraḥ* and comes first.

2. The word *ac* from P. 1.2.27 is continued. See P. 1.2.28, under 2. The words *nīcaiḥ* and *anudāttaḥ* are cancelled by the incompatible items *samāhāraḥ and svaritaḥ*.

3. For the reason why Pāṇini has defined the notion of *svarita* see P. 1.2.29, under 3. Examples of the use of the term *svarita* as a condition for grammatical operations are P. 1.2.40 and P. 6.1.185.

4. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I. p. 208, line 1) asks how the word *samāhāra*, which is a substantive, can refer to a vowel. He offers two explanations. According to the last explanation, the final *a* of the word *samāhāra*, is *matvarthīya* 'conveying the sense of *matUP*' (by P. 5.2.127). Thus *samāhāra* should be taken to mean *samāhāravant* 'possessing a combined pitch'.

5. For the original meaning of *svarita* see Wackernagel I, 1896, p. 291 (para 249 b). Compare also Whitney's observations on *Atharvaveda Prātiśākhya* 1.14–16, where he mentions the term *dviyama* 'having a double pitch' used in the *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya* 19.3 as a synonym of *svarita*. Another synonym used in the *Ṛktantravyākaraṇa* and mentioned by Allen 1953, p. 88, is *unnīca* 'high–low'.

6. What is combined is *udātta* and *anudātta*, in that order. Thus the *svarita* may be described as a falling tone, a glide from the high register of voice to the low register of voice. In that sense the *svarita* may be termed a contour tone, as different from the register tones *udātta* and *anudātta*.

7. A suffix marked with the *anubandha T* has the *svarita* accent by P. 6.1.185. For instance, *kartavya* 'to be done'. Here the verbal base *kṛ–* is *udātta* by P. 6.1.162. The suffix *tavyaT* is *svarita* by P. 6.1.185. Since the *svarita* accent comes in a later stage of the derivational process (*satiśiṣṭa*), it overrules the *udātta* accent of the verbal base, by *Vt.* IX on P. 6.1.158. See *STHANI*, Pt. I, fn. 366.

8. Like the *Prātiśākhya* authors, Pāṇini distinguishes types of *svarita*. Two of them are usually referred to as independent *svarita* and dependent *svarita*. Compare Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, paras 85–86; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, Lautlehre 1896, para 246; Allen 1953, p. 88–89. The independent *svarita* results from the suppression of an *udātta* syllable, as in *kú–a* → *kva*, and in *súv–ar* → *svar*. In vedic texts this is a relatively recent

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

phenomenon. The dependent (or enclitic) *svarita* is a mere variant of an *anudātta* vowel immediately following an *udātta* vowel. The relevant Pāṇini-*sūtras* are P. 8.2.4 (for the independent *svarita*) and P. 8.4.66 (for the dependent *svarita*).

9. One of the examples offered for the *svarita* accent by the *KV* is the indeclinable *kva* ' where '. It is derived as follows :

(1)	(*kim* + *Ṅi*) + *aT*	P. 5.3.12
(2)	((*kim* + *i*) + *a*) + *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(3)	((*kim* + °) + *a*) + *s*	P. 2.4.71
(4)	(*kva* + *a*) + *s*	P. 7.2.105
(5)	(*kv*° + *a*) + *s*	P. 6.4.148
(6)	*kva* + °	P. 2.4.82
	kva.	

In stage (1) since the *svarita* accent of *aT* is *satiśiṣṭa* (see under 7), and since P. 6.1.158 allows one accented syllable only in a *pada*, the other vowels will be *anudātta*. As a matter of fact, the vowel of the case ending *Ṅi* was already *anudātta* by P. 3.1.4. In stage (4), by the same reasoning, the substitute *kva* will be *anudātta*. In stage (5) the *anudātta* vowel of *kva* is deleted. Consequently, the *svarita* vowel of the suffix *aT* becomes the final vowel of *kva*.

1.2.32 TASYĀDITA UDĀTTAM ARDHAHRASVAM ' of this (*svarita*), from the beginning, the (duration of) half of a short (vowel is) *udātta* '.

1. The *KV* explains that, although *svarita* has been defined as a combined high – low pitch, we do not know yet the duration of the single *udātta* and *anudātta* portions. That is why the present rule has been phrased.

The present rule is a *paribhāṣā*. It lays down the convention that, when the term *svarita* is to be applied, it is to be understood as having the *udātta* pitch lasting for half a *mātrā*, starting right from the beginning of the *svarita*.

2. As indicated by the word *tasya*, which refers back to the word *svarita* in P. 1.2.31, and by the introduction of a new incompatible *uddeśya*, and *vidheya*, P. 1.2.32 must be a separate rule. Apart from the word *svaritaḥ* in P. 1.2.31, which undergoes *vibhaktivipariṇāma* ' a change of case ending', as is clear from the genitive word *tasya*, any other items from the previous rules have been discontinued.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The *uddeśya* is *tasya āditaḥ ardhahrasvam*. The *vidheya* is *udāttam*.

3. The *KV* explains the ablative word *āditaḥ* as a locative, *ādau* ' in/at the beginning ', for no apparent reason. In the translation the ablative value has been retained.

4. Literally, the word *ardhahrasvam* means *hrasvasya ardham* ' half of a short one ', by P. 2.2.2. See *TA*, Note (1).

According to Patañjali (*Mbh*. I, p. 208, line 12), the word *ardhahrasva* is to be interpreted as *ardhahrasvamātram* ' (that) which has the measure of half a short (vowel) '. Here the suffix *mātraC* has been added by P. 5.2.37. and subsequently deleted by part of a *ślokavārttika* on the same rule (*pramāṇe laḥ*, *Mbh*. II, p. 378, line 2).

5. From the present rule we understand that the *udātta* portion of the *svarita* lasts for half a *mātrā* only, independent of the length of the vowel. That is to say, in the case of a short vowel which counts for one *mātrā*, the *udātta* and *anudātta* portions will be equal, half a *mātrā* each. In the case of a long and a *pluta* vowel, the *udātta* and *anudātta* portions will be unequal, according to the ratio of one half to one and a half (*adhyardha*), and of one half to two and a half (*ardhatṛtīya*), as stated at the end of the *KV* commentary here.

But it appears that there is another tradition also, according to which the duration of the *udātta* portion of the *svarita* is equal to half of that of the vowel independent of the length of the vowel. Thus the ratios of *udātta* and *anudātta* in the case of a short, long and *pluta* vowel will be a half to a half, one to one and one and a half to one and a half respectively.

This is the tradition to which the *KV* refers by saying that the word *hrasva* in *ardhahrasva* is *atantra*. The *Śabdakaustubha* (*Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series*, Vol. II, Benares 1929, p. 15) on P. 1.2.32 says *yad vā hrasvagrahaṇam avivakṣitam* ' or rather, the mention of (the word) *hrasva* is not specifically intended '. Accordingly, *ardhahrasvam ūdāttam* is interpreted to mean *ardham udāttam* ' half is *udātta* ', that is, half of the *svarita* is *udātta*. Consequently the other half will be *anudātta*.

Thus, again (see P. 1.2.29, under 5), the *KV* text as we have it presents two mutually contradictory views, one of which says *ardhamātrā udātta* ' half a *mātrā* is *udattā* ', whereas the other says *ardham eva udāttam* the exact half is *udātta*. The source of the second view is not known. It may go back to a *prātiśākhya* tradition, and it may have been inserted into the text of the *KV* by a later revisor.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

6. A *svarita* vowel when followed by either *udātta* or *svarita* is pronounced with both pitches. But when followed by an *anudātta* vowel, only the *udātta* portion of the *svarita* is heard, not the *anudātta* portion. In *prātiśākhya* literature the latter case is known as *pracaya* or *udāttaśruti*. See the *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya* 21.10–11, and Whitney's notes here (p. 386-9), Compare also Whitney's observations on *Atharvaveda Prātiśākhya* 3.65 (p. 164–169 of Whitney's edition). The idea put forward here (p. 165) is that the voice after having been raised to *udātta* pitch does not come down with a leap to *anudātta* level, but makes its descent in the course of the pronunciation of the next following syllable.

7. For the *prātiśākhya* doctrines the first part of the *svarita*, its height and length, see *Ṛk–Prātiśākhya* 3.2.3 (referred to by Whitney, *The Athavaveda Prātiśākhya*, The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. Second Edition 1962, p. 165; and Allen 1953, p. 88); *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya* 1.41-45 for its own views, and 1. 46–47 for those of others; and the *Atharvaveda Prātiśākhya* 1.17. The latter text says *svaritasyādito mātrārdham udāttam* 'half a *mātrā* of the *svarita*, from its beginning, is *udātta* '.

8. Kātyāyana, in *Vt.* I on the present rule, proposes to shift the sequence P. 1.2.32–40 to the eighth *adhyāya*, after P. 8.4.66. The reason for this remarkable proposal is the placement of two different rules dealing with *svarita* in different sections of the *A*. The first rule is P. 8.4.66. It prescribes the substitution of *svarita* for an *anudātta* which immediately follows an *udātta*. The second rule is P. 1.2.39, which says that *ekaśruti* 'one single tone' comes in the place of *anudātta* vowels which immediately follow a *svarita* vowel, in continuous recitation. The simplified example, is *imaṃ me gaṅge* 'this one (sg. acc. masc.) of mine, o *Gaṅgā* ! ' (compare *Mbh.* I, p. 209, line 10), taken from *ṚgV.* 10.75.5. Here the last vowel of *imam* is *udātta* by P. 8.2.5, *me* is *anudātta* by P. 8.1.22, and *gaṅge* is wholly *anudātta* by P. 8.1.19. By P. 8.4.66 the *anudātta* of *me* is replaced by *svarita*. This should be the condition for uttering the vowels of *gaṅge* with *ekaśruti*, by P. 1.2.39. But since P. 8.4.66 is a *tripādī*-rule, the result of its application is *asiddha* 'not having taken effect' as far as the application of P. 1.2.39 is concerned. Still, the application of this latter rule is desired. This is Kātyāyana's difficulty which he finally resolves in *Vt.* V, by assuming a clue.

The difficulty can, however, be solved by a more drastic assumption, namely, that the rules dealing with *ekaśruti* do not form part of the original *A.*, but were introduced here from *Śrautasūtra* literature to lend authority to *Śrautasūtra* practice, which may differ again according to different *śākhās*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

9. One of the examples offered by the *KV* is *māṇavakā3 māṇavaka* 'o boy, o boy'. Here, by P. 8.2.103, the final vowel of the first vocative in a succesion of two vocatives is to be spoken with *pluta* and *svarita*, in order to convey annoyance, etc.

1.2.33 EKAŚRUTI DŪRĀT SAMBUDDHAU 'when calling (takes place) from a distance, (the utterance) has one single tone'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing a neutral, accentless tone for calling from a distance.

2. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya* any previous subject and predicate item is discontinued. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

The *uddeśya* is *dūrāt saṃbuddhau*. The *vidheya* is *ekaśruti*.

3. The *KV* on the present rule explains the neuter word *ekaśruti* as a *bv.* cp. in the sense of *ekā śrutir yasya tad idam ekaśruti* 'that which is heard in the same tone (is called) *ekaśruti*'. The word supplied is *vākyam* 'utterance', for which compare P. 8.2.82.

4. The *KV*, following Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 210, line 4) explains that the word *saṃbuddhi* in the present rule is not used in its technical sense of the sg. vocative, as defined by P. 2.3.48–49, but in its etymological sense of *saṃbodhana* 'calling'. We note that in P. 8.2.84 the word *saṃbuddhi* is not used, but the non–technical word *hūta* 'calling'.

5. What exactly do we understand by *ekaśruti*? Whereas Pāṇini has defined *udātta*, etc., which form part of his *upadeśa*, no definition is offered for *ekaśruti*. In any case, this term does not form part of the *upadeśa*. It is never used as a condition for grammatical operations, but wherever mentioned it functions as the *vidheya*.

Patañjali mentions two opinions. The first holds that *ekaśruti* is neither *udātta* nor *anudātta* but a middle pitch between these two (*Mbh.* I, 210, line 10). The second opinion holds that it is both *udātta* and *anudātta* (*Mbh.* I, p. 210, lines 11–13). As explained by Kaiyaṭa (on *Bh.* No. 9 on P. 1.2.33), *ekaśruti* shows a colouring (*anurāga*), now of *udātta*, then again of *anudātta*.

The *KV* says : *traisvarye padānāṃ prāpte ... aikaśrutyam vidhīyate* 'when the three accents of *padas* have a chance to apply, one single tone is prescribed'. Afterwards the notion of *ekaśruti* is defined as *svarāṇām*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

udāttādīnām avibhāgaḥ 'non-differentiation of the accents *udātta* etc.', that is, *bhedatirodhānam* 'disappearance of difference'.

Accordingly, by *ekaśruti* we have to understand a type of speech which shows, at least, a sharp reduction of intonational contrasts. Compare also the *Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra*, 1.2.9, which defines *aikaśrutya* as *udāttānudātta-svaritānāṃ paraḥ sannikarṣaḥ* 'the closest approximation of *udātta*, *anudātta* and *svarita*'.

The idea of Wackernagel I, 1896, para 253, that *ekaśruti* should be regarded as an early stage of the loss of the ancient accentual system is worthless. *Ekaśruti*, as will be stated later on, is a practice adopted for convenience only.

6. The present rule, which prescribes *ekaśruti*, when calling from a distance, is at variance with P. 8.2.84. The latter rule prescribes (*pluta* and) *udātta* for the final vowel of an utterance, when calling from a distance. Here the final vowel is that of a vocative word at the end of the utterance. To bring out a contrast between the two rules, the example for P. 1.2.33 should begin with a vocative word. But, in fact, the examples for both rules offered by the *KV* are identical.

Inconsistencies in the *A.* provide evidence for the existence of layers in the text of the A., in the sense that rules have been added to an original body of rules at a later date. It is hardly conceivable that Pāṇini would have phrased rules which clash with other rules in his system (see Joshi–Roodbergen 1983, p. 92–93). Considering that Pāṇini carefully prescribes the accentuation of *laukika* speech also, of stems, suffixes and complete utterances, and considering that P. 1.2.33 goes against P. 8.2.84, it may be conjectured that *ekaśruti* is not a Pāṇinian concept, but was introduced into the *A.* to accommodate later, rather lax practice. Compare also P. 1.2.32, under 8.

7. The example offered by the *KV* is *āgaccha bho māṇavaka devadattā3* 'come, o boy Devadatta!'. Here, by P. 8.2.84, the final vowel of the utterance should be a *pluta*-vowel with *udātta*-pitch. But by the present rule, since all pitch-differences have been discarded, only the final *pluta*-vowel remains.

The counterexample–when not calling from a distance–is *āgaccha bho māṇavaka devadatta* 'come, o boy Devadatta'. As explained by the *Nyāsa*, this utterance will be spoken with the three accents. The accents are subsequently stated for every word.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.2.34 YAJÑAKARMAṆY AJAPANYŪṄKHASĀMASU 'when a sacrifice is being performed, (*ekaśruti* " recitation on a single tone " is used) with the exception of *japa*, *nyūṅkha* and (the singing of) *sāmans* '.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. It prescribes the use of *ekaśruti* at particular occasions with particular exceptions. No *bhāṣya* by Patañjali is available.

2. The word *ekaśrutiḥ* (with a change of gender) is continued from P. 1.2.33. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* all previous *uddeśya*-items are discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

The *uddeśya* is *yajñakarmaṇi ajapanyūṅkhasāmasu*. The *vidheya* is *ekaśrutiḥ*.

3. Although it is possible to continue the neuter word *ekaśruti* from P. 1.2.33, it seems more appropriate to supply the word *pāṭhaḥ* 'recitation' in connection with the term *ekaśruti* in the present rule. That is why *ekaśrutiḥ* here appears in the masculine gender.

4. The *KV* explains the word *yajñakarman* as *yajñakriyā* 'the performance of a sacrifice'. The purpose of this word is to exclude *saṃpāṭha* 'recitation (for purposes of study)' from the use of *ekaśruti*. In *saṃpāṭha*, *traisvarya* '(the use of) the three accents' is obligatory.

5. To what does the word *japa* refer ? The word *japa* is not used or explained in the *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya*. In the *Śrautasūtras*, on the other hand, the action called *japa* and forms derived from the verbal base *jap-* are used frequently.

The Hyderabad critical edition of the *KV* Part I, p. 39, reads *japo 'nukaraṇamantra upāṃśuprayogaḥ*, and notes a variant reading *akaraṇamantraḥ*, already known to the *Nyāsa* here. By *mantra* we will simply understand a Vedic, non–brāhmaṇa passage used for purposes of ritual, including sacrifice. Then four questions arise :

A. What could *anukaraṇamantra* mean ?

B. What could *akaraṇamantra* mean ?

C. Which is the reading to be preferred ?

D. What does *upāṃśu* mean ?

The questions will be discussed in this order.

A. In connection with both *anukaraṇamantra* and *akaraṇamantra* the basic difficulty is which meaning to ascribe to the constituent *karaṇa*. Later

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

grammatical tradition (the *Nyāsa* and the *Padamañjarī*) think that *karaṇa* in the context given is to be interpreted as *uccāraṇam* 'uttering', that is, recitation.

However, *karaṇa* in a context of ritual has a different meaning. For instance, the *Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra* (ed. by Rāmanārāyaṇa Vidyāratna. *Bibliotheca Indica*. Calcutta 1874), 1.21, says *mantrāś ca karmakaraṇāḥ* '*mantras* which are (involved in) the performance of ritual acts (are also uttered under one's breath) '. Here *karaṇa* is used in its original meaning of 'doing, performing'. Keeping this in mind we may then posit the meaning of the word *karaṇamantra*, that is, *karmakaraṇamantra* as a *mantra* connected with the performance of a ritual act, uttered while performing that act.

Now what could *anukaraṇamantra* mean ? *Anu* means 'following' which, again, admits of various shades of meaning. In the sense of *karaṇānugataḥ mantraḥ* 'a *mantra* (recited) subsequent to the performance (of a ritual act) ' we derive *anukaraṇamantraḥ* (*Vt.* X on P. 2.2.18; see *TA*, p. 194). This meaning fits in with what is known about *japa*, especially of Yajurvedic mantras in *Śrautasūtra* literature. We note that, at least in one important type of sacrifice (the *jyotiṣṭoma*), these mantras are to be recited softly, in distinction from passages from the *Ṛgveda*. See G. Jha, *Pūrvamīmāṃsā in its Sources*. Second edition. Varanasi 1964, p. 248–9.

B. Logically following up its interpretation of *karaṇa* as *uccāraṇa* and in accordance with the context of *japa* as *upāṃśuprayoga*, the *Nyāsa* interprets *akaraṇa* as *īṣat karaṇam uccāraṇaṃ yasya saḥ* 'that (*mantra*) which has (only) little utterance', that is a muttered *mantra*.

However, on the supposition that *karaṇa* means 'doing, performance (of the manual ritual act) ', *akaraṇa* can only mean 'non-performance'. Consequently, *akaraṇamantra* can hardly mean anything else than 'a *mantra* (meant) for non-performance', which is absurd.

C. Although the word *akaraṇamantra* in the interpretation given by the *Nyāsa* makes sense, it is based on the doubtful meaning of *uccāraṇa* assigned to *karaṇa*. If, however, in the situation of *yajñakarman*, *karaṇa* is to be interpreted in the sense of 'doing, performing', which seems at least likely, then the reading *akarmakaraṇa* is to be rejected. Consequently, the reading *anukaraṇamantra* is to be preferred.

D. *Upāṃśuprayoga* means the use of a particular kind of voice, whispering. This kind of voice is mentioned and defined in the *Taittirīya*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Prātiśākhya, 23.5–6, as *karaṇavat* 'involving the (use of the) speech-organs', *aśabda* 'soundless', and *amanaḥprayoga* 'not involving the use of the mind'. To illustrate the idea of *upāṃśu*, the *Nyāsa* says *yathā jale nimagnasya pāṭhaḥ* 'like the recitation of someone under water'.

The words *anukaraṇamantra* and *upāṃśuprayoga* state two characteristics of *japa*. *Japa* is recitation of a mantra after the performance of a ritual act, and *japa* is recitation under one's breath. In the *KV* text the word *upāṃśuprayogaḥ* functions as an adjective in connection with *anukaraṇamantraḥ*. That is to say, here the cp. *upāṃśuprayoga* is a *bv.* cp.

6. According to the *Padamañjarī* on the *KV* here, *nyūṅkha* refers to sixteen sounds *o* not ending in *m*. The first, seventh and thirteenth *o* are *udātta* and count for three *mātrās*, whereas the remaining thirteen are *anudātta* and count for half an *o*. As stated by V. S. Agrawala 1963, p. 379. n. 4, *nyūṅkha* refers to the recitation by the *hotṛ* at the morning libation of a *somayāga* consisting of sixteen sounds *o*.

7. *Sāmans* are melodies (*gīti*) associated with particular utterances, as stated by the *KV* on the present rule. Accordingly the word refers to music only, not to the *mantra*–text which has been set to music. See G. Jha, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

8. The example for *ekaśruti* offered by the *KV* is *ṚgV.* 8.44.16 *agnir mūrddhā divaḥ kakut patiḥ pṛthivyā ayam|apāṃ retāṃsi jinvato3m* 'Agni is the head, the top of heaven, the lord of the earth. He strengthens the seeds of the waters'. As explained by the *Nyāsa* here, the *ṭi*–portion of the form *jinvati* is replaced by *o3m*, by P. 8.2.89, which is *udātta* and *pluta* by P. 8.2.82.

9. For *ekaśruti* see P. 1.2.33, under 5. The practice of *ekaśruti* is also mentioned by the *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya*, 15.9, which says *sarvam ekayamaṃ pūrveṣām* 'all has (or may have) one single pitch, according to the earlier (teachers)'.

By allowing *ekaśruti* for the recitation of *mantras* during the performance of a sacrifice a concession is made to the officiating brahmins. The present *sūtra* authorizes them to reel off the *mantras* at considerable speed. And, obviously, ignorance of the proper accentuation will be covered completely and mistakes prevented. Little wonder then that protests were heard. As mentioned by V. S. Agrawala 1963, p. 379–80, Jaimini made a strong attempt to restore the practice of reciting Vedic mantras with the three accents for ritual purposes also.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.2.35 UCCAISTARĀṂ VĀ VAṢAṬKĀRAḤ '(when a sacrifice is being performed) the word *vaṣaṭ* (is) preferably (uttered) in a higher pitch (than *udātta*)'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* which lays down a rule regarding proper intonation. No *bhāṣya* by Patañjali is available.

2. Only the word *yajñakarmaṇi* is continued from P. 1.2.34. The word *ekaśruti* is discontinued by the incompatible item *uccaistarām*. The other previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are also discontinued.

The *uddeśya* is *yajñakarmaṇi vaṣaṭkāraḥ*. The *vidheya* is *uccaistarāṃ vā*.

3. The form *uccaistarām* is an adverb formed by P. 5.4.11. Since in the *A*. *uccaiḥ* is the defining characteristic of *udātta*, *uccaistara* can only refer to a higher pitch than *udātta*.

According to the *Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra*, 1.5.6, the exclamation *vaṣaṭ* is to be uttered *uccaistarām* ' in a higher pitch ' and *balīyān* ' louder ' than the *yājyā* at whose end the exclamation is made.

The present rule does not state which vowel of *vaṣaṭ* should have the pitch prescribed. In practice, it is the first vowel which is also pronounced with *pluti* (P. 8.2.91 : *Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra*, 1.5.7).

4. The *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya*, 1.16, informs us that the mention of a speechsound followed by *kāra* stands for the name of that sound. In fact, the use of *kāra* in this sense is a *prātiśākhya* (and *śrautasūtra*) tradition, not a pāṇinian one. Contrast *vaṣaṭkāra* in the present rule with *vauṣaṭ* in P. 8.2.91.

5. As stated by the *KV*, the present rule also holds for the alternative form *vauṣaṭ* mentioned in P. 8.2.91. Then why doesn't the present rule use the word *vauṣaṭ* also ? The *KV* says *vaicitryārtham. Vicitrā hi sūtrasya kṛtiḥ pāṇineḥ* ' in order to (create a sense of) wonder. Because the formulation of Pāṇini's *sūtras* is varied '. Compare *Mbh*. I, p. 468, line 10.

Vaṣaṭ or *vauṣaṭ* is the exclamation on hearing which the *adhvaryu* throws the libation into the fire. As stated above, the *vaṣaṭ* call comes at the end of all *yājyā* verses. Traditionally (the *Nyāsa* here), its meaning is explained as *devānāṃ dānam* ' a gift to the gods '.

6. The word *vā* ' preferably ' (see Kiparski 1979, p. 1) is used in the *A*. either at the beginning or at the end of a *sūtra* (Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 244). Therefore the place of *vā* in the present rule may be taken as another indication –next to the use of *kāra*– that this rule (as, in fact, the whole sequence P. 1.2.33–40) comes from a different, presumably *śrautasūtra* source.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Since Pāṇini applies *sandhi* in the formulation of his rules, a proper Pāṇinian phrasing of the present rule would have been *vodāttataro vaṣaṭ*.

7. P. 1.2.35 states an option. Therefore *ekaśruti* is also allowed, be it as the lesser option.

8. The example quoted by the *KV* comes from the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 3.5.4.6. It reads *somasyāgne vīhī3 vau3ṣaṭ* 'o Agni, partake of Soma. (The second) *vau3ṣaṭ* (call) ..'. Compare the *Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra*, 2.16.2 and 3.9.4.

1.2.36 VIBHĀṢĀ CHANDASI '(*ekaśruti* is) better not (used) in (the recitation of) the Vedas '.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* dealing with the proper intonation. No *bhāṣya* by Patañjali is available.

2. The word *ekaśrutiḥ*, which was discontinued in P. 1.2.35, is continued again in the present rule, from P. 1.2.34. Traditionally, this is called *maṇḍūkapluti* 'frog-jump', that is, the skipping of one or more rules in the order of *anuvṛtti*. In fact, *maṇḍūkapluti* is a disturbance of regular *anuvṛtti*.

The word *vā* from P. 1.2.35 is set aside by the term *vibhāṣā* in the present rule. *Vā* and *vibhāṣā* convey different meanings, see Kiparski 1979, p. 1. The word *yajñakarmaṇi* is cancelled by *chandasi*. Other *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items from the previous rules have also been cancelled by the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya*.

The *uddeśya* is *chandasi*. The *vidheya* is *vibhāṣā ekaśrutiḥ*.

3. According to P. Thieme, (*Pāṇini and the Veda*. Allahabad 1935, p. 7,) *chandasi* is the most general term by which Pāṇini refers to the Veda. See *ATA*, fn. 131.

It may be mentioned in passing that, according to the *Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra*, 1.5.38, in the case of a mistake in the prescribed intonation, the *hotṛ* should mutter the text *ato devā avantu naḥ* 'from this may the gods protect us' (*Ṛgv*. 1.22.16).

4. As stated by the *KV*, by the present rule the use of *ekaśruti* is allowed– although it is the lesser option– even in the recitation of the Vedas for purposes of study. Excluded from this option, in any case, is the *Sāmaveda*, as stipulated by P. 1.2.34.

5. In the Hyderabad critical edition the *KV* commentary on the present rule ends with four double examples, each time one for *ekaśruti* recitation and one for recitation with the three accents. The second example is *agna āyāhi*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

vītaye 'o Agni, come to the feast' (*Ṛgv.* 6.16.10). The fourth example is *śaṃ no devīr abhiṣṭaye* 'to our luck may the goddesses come to our protection' (*ṚgV.* 10.9.4).

1.2.37 (a) NA SUBRAHMAṆYĀYĀM '(*ekaśruti* is) not (allowed) in (the recitation of) the *Subrahmaṇyā* '.

1. The rule translated here is not P. 1.2.37 in its traditional form. We propose to divide the rule into two, as follows :

P. 1.2.37 (a) *na subrahmaṇyāyām,*

P. 1.2.37 (b) *svaritasya tu udāttaḥ.*

The reasons for this division are that a rule cannot have two *vidheyas,* and that the word *tu,* like *ca,* functions like a boundary marker. Both *ca* and *tu* are regularly put after the first word of a rule.

2. P. 1.2.37 (a) is a *vidhisūtra* which lays down the proper intonation of a particular Vedic passage.

3. In the sequence P. 1.2.35–37 we find successively the words *vā, vibhāṣā* and *na.* Here each following item cancels the previous one. As regards the cancellation of *vibhāṣā* by *na* see Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 86–88.

4. The word *ekaśruti* is continued from P. 1.2.36. Any other previous *uddeśya* or *vidheya* item is cancelled by the new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya.*

The *uddeśya* is *subrahmaṇyāyām.* The *vidheya* is *ekaśrutiḥ na.*

5. According to the *KV,* the *subrahmaṇyā* is a *nigada.* As stated by the *Nyāsa* here, a *nigada* is a non–metrical (Vedic) composition, which is to be recited loudly. In fact, the *Subrahmaṇyā* is an invocation of Indra to be recited in Soma–sacrifices, usually by an officiant called *subrahmaṇya.* Compare V. S. Agrawala 1963, p. 380.

The *KV* also mentions the text of the *Subrahmaṇyā.* Compare Böhtlingk's note on P. 1.2.37, where the reference for the passage is given (*Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 3.3.4.17 ff.).

6. The word *subrahmaṇyā* is a fem. derivation – the name of a goddess called by the ministrant called *subrahmaṇya,* compare *Ṣaḍviṃśabrāhmaṇa* 1.1.7 – of *subrahmaṇya.* As stated by the *Nyāsa* here, the latter word is derived from *subrahman* by adding the suffix *yaT,* by P. 4.4.98. Thus *subrahmaṇya* literally means 'good, efficient as regards *subrahman* '. The brahmin known as

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

subrahmaṇya is a Sāmavedin. The word *subrahman* may therefore be taken to refer to a *mantra* text set to music.

The suffix *yaT* being marked with *T* has the *svarita* pitch, by P. 6.1.185. In deriving the word *subrahmaṇya* the fem. suffix *ṬāP* is added by P. 4.1.4. This suffix is *anudātta* by P. 3.1.4. The result of the addition of *Ṭāp* is a succession of a *svarita* vowel (*yaT*) and an *anudātta* vowel (*Ṭāp*). The two vowels are replaced by one single vowel *ā*, by P. 6.1.101. But what happens to the accent ? As stated by the *Padamañjarī* here, the single substitute vowel will be *svarita*, because this pitch is *antaratama*, (P. 1.1.50). That is to say, the *svarita* is the nearest pitch to the original pitches, because it combines both.

7. Kātyāyana has phrased nine *Vārttikas* on P. 1.2.37. They state, in great detail, the correct accentuation of the words of the *Subrahmaṇyā* invocation.

1.2.37 (b) SVARITASYA TŪDĀTTAḤ '(in the *Subrahmaṇyā*) however, the *udātta* (pitch) is substituted for the *svarita* (pitch) '.

1. For the division of P. 1.2.37 see 1.2.37 (a), under 1.

2. P. 1.2.37 (b) is a *vidhisūtra* which lays down the proper accentuation of the *Subrahmaṇyā*.

3. The word *subrahmaṇyāyām* is continued from P. 1.2.37 (a). The word *na* is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*, that is, because it does not make sense in the present rule. The prohibition of *ekaśruti* does not make sense in a rule prescribing *udātta* in the place of *svarita*. Any other previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are cancelled by the new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya*.

The *uddeśya* is *subrahmaṇyāyāṃ tu*. The *vidheya* is *svaritasya udāttaḥ*.

4. The word *svaritasya* is a technical genitive, prescribed by P. 1.1.49 in the sense of ' in place '.

5. According to P. 1.2.37 (a), the use of *ekaśruti* is disallowed in the *Subrahmaṇyā*. Therefore *traisvarya* '(the use of) the three accents ' applies. Now the present rule prescribes that wherever by rules of grammar the *svarita* pitch would become applicable–and only there–, the *udātta* pitch is to be used instead. This is explained by the *KV* for every separate line of the *Subrahmaṇyā*. Why in the *Subrahmaṇyā* the *svarita* accent is to be replaced by a *udātta* is not known.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.2.38 DEVABRAHMAṆOR ANUDĀTTAḤ '(in the *Subrahmaṇyā*) the *anudātta* (pitch is substituted for the *svarita* pitch) of (the words) *deva* and *brahman* '.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* which lays down the proper accentuation of the words mentioned.

2. The words *subrahmaṇyāyāṃ svaritasya* are continued from P. 1.2.37 (b). Any other previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are discontinued by the introduction of a new incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya*.

The *uddeśya* is *subrahmaṇyāyāṃ devabrahmaṇoḥ svaritasya*. The *vidheya* is *anudāttaḥ*.

3. The words meant are actually the plural vocatives *devāḥ* and *brahmāṇaḥ* as in the example quoted by the *KV*, *devā brahmāṇa āgacchata* ' o gods, o brahmins, come ! ', taken from the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* P. 3.3.1.20.

The vocatives are *ādyudātta* by P. 6.1.198. The other vowels are *anudātta*, by P. 6.1.158. The *anudātta* pitch of vowels which immediately follow a vowel with *udātta* pitch is replaced by *svarita* by P. 8.4.66. Then, after the application of the latter rule, P. 1.2.38 is to be applied.

But this lands us in the same difficulty stated earlier, in connection with P. 1.2.32. P. 8.4.66 is a *tripādī*-rule, which is *asiddha* as far as the application of P. 1.2.38 is concerned. The difficulty was noted by Kātyāyana, see P. 1.2.32 under 6. The first solution proposed by Kātyāyana here was to shift the sequence P. 1.2.32-40 to the eighth *adhyāya*, after P. 8.4.66. Another solution would be to accept *asiddhatva*. The consequence, then, would be that P. 1.2.38 is futile. But, thus the reasoning goes, Pāṇinisūtras cannot be futile. Therefore we must accept that, still, P. 1.2.38 applies after the application of P. 8.4.66, because, as compared to the breach of *asiddhatva*, *anarthakatva* ' redundancy ' is the greater grammatical evil.

As stated already under P. 1.2.32, note 8, the problem noted by Kātyāyana is due to the fact that the rules P. 1.2.32-40, dealing mainly with *ekaśruti*, have been inserted in the original body of rules of the A. at a later date. They must have been inserted rules, because

(1) *Ekaśruti* is not a Pāṇinian concept, see P. 1.2.33, under 6.

(2) The rules P. 1.2.32-40 contain very specialized instructions regarding Vedic recitation, which is out of character with other rules in the *A.* regarding

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

vedic data. With the exception of rules dealing with vedic *nipātanas*, the rules dealing with vedic data are phrased in very general terms, like *bahulaṃ chandasi*. See further Kiparski 1979, p. 56, 'Almost always, the vedic peculiarities are derived in the *A*. by patch-up rules...'. In fact, the vedic rules themselves may have been added later on only.

(3) The *anuvṛtti* order of the rules P. 1.2.32–40 is disturbed because of *maṇḍūkapluti* twice, in a relatively short sequence.

(4) The terminology used in this sequence is unique in the *A*., and strongly reminiscent of a *Śrautasūtra* source.

In conclusion, it may be maintained that the rules P. 1.2.32–40 deal with a subject outside the domain of Pāṇini's grammar; that these rules have been badly arranged; and that these rules have been badly inserted in the *A*., disturbing the principle of *asiddhatva*.

4. According to Kātyāyana, *Vt*. I on P. 1.2.38, the present rule should be phrased as *devabrahmaṇor anudāttatvam eke* 'some (grammarians want the words) *deva* and *brahman* (in the *Subrahmaṇyā*) to have *anudātta* (pitch instead of *svarita*)'. The consequence of the addition of the word *eke* is that the rule becomes optional. That is to say, we either replace the *svarita* pitch (by P. 8.4.66) by *anudātta* (by P. 1.2.38), or we don't.

1.2.39 SVARITĀT SAṂHITĀYĀM ANUDĀTTĀNĀM 'in *saṃhitā* " continuous recitation " (*ekaśruti*) is substituted for *anudātta* (pitches) which immediately follow a *svarita* (pitch)'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* which prescribes proper intonation.

2. In connection with the present rule the *KV* offers both a vedic and a *laukika* example, as different from Patañjali who offers a vedic example only (*Mbh*. I, p. 212, lines 9–10).

Generally, the rules of the *A*. are applicable to both vedic language and to non-vedic Sanskrit speech, unless a restriction of the rule concerned is stated, like *chandasi* 'in a vedic metrical text' or *bhāṣāyām* 'in the spoken language'. But since P. 1.2.39 prescribes *ekaśruti*, which is a non-Pāṇinian concept, it can hardly be considered to be an original Pāṇinian rule. It follows that, as regards its domain of application, P. 1.2.39 need not follow Pāṇinian practice. Therefore, taking into consideration that Patañjali offers a vedic example only, and that the whole previous sequence, from P. 1.2.32 onwards deals with peculiarities of vedic pronunciation, it may be argued that P. 1.2.39

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

also deals with such a peculiarity and that the *laukika* example offered by the *KV* is out of place. Consequently, the word *saṃhitāyām* in this rule has been translated as *saṃhitāpāṭhe* 'in continuous recitation' (as different from other ways of reciting the Vedas), rather than as 'in continuous speech'. See also under 8.

In the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* 21.10 the word *saṃhitāyām* is used in exactly the same sense of *saṃhitāpāṭhe*, in connection with a peculiar vedic pitch called *pracaya*.

3. The word *ekaśruti* is continued from P. 1.2.36. Traditionally, this is known as *maṇḍūkapluti*. See P. 1.2.36, under 2. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya* any previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are cancelled.

The *uddeśya* is *svaritāt saṃhitāyām anudāttānām*. The *vidheya* is *ekaśrutiḥ*.

4. The term *saṃhitā* forming part of Pāṇini's *upadeśa* is defined by P. 1.4.109 as maximum proximity, that is immediate sequence of speechsounds which erases boundaries like *aṅga*, *bha* and *pada*. See S. D. Joshi 1984, p. 185–86. Given this maximum proximity (P. 6.1.72) phonological rules become applicable which ensure the correct pronunciation of the speechsounds concerned.

5. As pointed out by Kātyāyana (*Vt.* I on the present rule), the plural word *anudāttānām*, strictly speaking, refers to a sequence of more than two *anudātta* pitches after the *svarita*. Then what happens, if only one or two *anudātta* pitches follow? Kātyāyana's solution is to replace the word *anudāttānām* in P. 1.2.39 by the expression *anekam api* 'also more than one (*anudātta* item which in continuous recitation immediately follows a *svarita* becomes *ekaśruti*)' (*Vt.* III on P. 1.2.39). Patañjali rejects Katyāyāna's proposal and offers a different solution (*Mbh.* I, p. 212, lines 15–16).

According to the *Nyāsa*, the plural form *anudāttānām* is an instance of a plural used to denote a class concept, by P. 1.2.58.

6. The vedic example offered and explained by the *KV* is *imaṃ me gaṅge yamune sarasvati śutudri* 'this one (sg. acc. masc.) of mine, o Gaṅgā, Yamunā, Sarasvatī (and) Śutudrī', taken from Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 212, lines 9–10). The quotation is from the *Ṛgveda* 10.75.5. Compare P. 1.2.32, under 8. In the quotation *imam* is *antodāttā* by P. 8.2.5, *me* is *anudātta* by P. 8.1.22, and *gaṅge* and the other vocatives are *anudātta* by P. 8.1.19.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The *anudātta* pitch of *me* is replaced by *svarita*, by the *tripādī* rule P. 8.4.66. Then, in spite of the *asiddha*–principle, P. 1.2.39 is to apply. Compare P. 1.2.38, under 3. According to P. 1.2.39, the *anudātta* pitch of the vowels coming after *me* is replaced by *ekaśruti*.

7. The second example quoted and completely explained by the *KV* consists of the initial word of the expression *māṇavaka jaṭilakādhyāpaka kva gamiṣyasi* ' o boy whose teacher wears matted hair, where will you go ? '. The expression is used again in the commentary on P. 1.2.40. Here the first syllable of *māṇavaka* is *udātta*, by P. 6.1.198. The second syllable is *svarita*, by P. 8.4.66. The remaining syllables are *anudātta* by P. 8.1.18. By the present rule the *anudātta* syllables are replaced by *ekaśruti*.

8. Finally, and in confirmation of what has been stated under 2, the *KV* explains that the word *saṃhitāyām* in the present rule is meant to exclude *avagraha*, a term known from *Prātiśākhya* literature, and used specifically in connection with vedic texts. The *Nyāsa* here tells us that *avagraha* means *asaṃhitāpāṭha* ' other than continuous recitation '.

1.2.40 UDĀTTASVARITAPARASYA SANNATARAḤ ' (for an *anudātta* pitch) which is immediately followed by an *udātta* or *svarita* (pitch), the (pitch called) *sannatara* is substituted '.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* which prescribes proper intonation. No *bhāṣya* by Patañjali is available.

2. As in the case of P. 1.2.39, the *KV* offers a *laukika* ' non–vedic ' example for the present rule also (see P. 1.2.39, under 7). Following the argument put forward in connection with P. 1.2.39, under 2, it may be argued here also that the example is out of place, and that P. 1.2.40 deals with a vedic peculiarity only.

3. The word *anudāttānām* from P. 1.2.39 is continued with a change of number. Instead of the plural *anudāttānām*, the present rule requires the sg. *anudāttasya* in conformity with the number of the qualifying word *udāttasvaritaparasya*. The word *ekaśruti* is cancelled by the incompatible item *sannataraḥ*. Any other previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are discontinued by the new incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya*.

The *uddeśya* is *anudāttasya udāttasvaritaparasya*. The *vidheya* is *sannataraḥ*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

4. The word *anudāttasya* is a technical genitive in connection with which the word *sthāne* is to be supplied, by P. 1.1.49. As explained by the *KV*, the constituent *para* is to be connected both with *udātta* and *svarita*.

5. Usually, to indicate that a grammatical operation takes place on an item which is followed by another item or other items, Pāṇini does not use the word *para*, but the locative, by P. 1.1.66. Therefore the genuine Pāṇinian formulation of the rule would be *sannataro 'nudāttasyodāttasvaritayoḥ* (with sandhi, as regularly applied by Pāṇini). The fact that *para* has been used in the present rule is just another indication of non–Pāṇinian origin.

6. The only other place in Sanskrit literature where the word *sannatara* is recorded is the *Atharvaveda Prātiśākhya* 1.42. Here, however, the question is of an incomplete pronunciation of consonants, as that of the first stop in a sequence of two stops. The *KV* explains the meaning of *sannatara* in P. 1.2.40 as *anudāttatara* ' (still) lower than *anudātta* '.

7. The *KV* offers three examples : (1) *devā marutaḥ pṛṣṇimātaro 'paḥ* ' the gods, the Maruts who have the earth as their mother, the waters ' (*Paippalāda Saṃhitā* 3.31.1; the Lahore edition, 1936 reads ... *mātaro apaḥ*), (2) *imaṃ me gaṅge yamune sarasvati śutudri* ' this (sg. acc. masc.) of mine, o Gaṅgā, Yamunā, Sarasvatī (and) Sutudrī ' (Ṛgveda 10.75.5; see P. 1.2.32, under 8; P. 1.2.39, under 6), and (3) *māṇavaka jaṭilakādhyāpaka kva gamiṣyasi* ' o boy, whose teacher wears matted hair, where will you go ? ' (see P. 1.2.39 under 7).

As explained by the *KV*, the relevant pitch–sequence in (1) is that of (... *māta*)*ro 'paḥ*. Detailed explanation is also given by the *Nyāsa* and *Padamañjarī* here. The case ending *Jas* (of *mātaras*) is *anudātta*, by P. 3.1.4. The ending *as* is replaced by *o*, after the application of P. 8.2.66 (*rU*), P. 6.1.113 (*u*) and P. 6.1.87. It is assumed that the substitute vowel *u* (P. 6.1.113) is *anudātta* by P. 3.1.4, because it comes in connection with a case–ending. Accordingly, the substitute vowel *o* (by P. 6.1.87) is *anudātta*, by P. 1.1.50. The form *apaḥ* is *antodātta*, by P. 6.1.171. Therefore the initial vowel must be *anudātta*, by P. 6.1.158. The final *o* of *mātaro* and the initial *a* of *apaḥ* are replaced by a single *o*, by P. 6.1.109. This substitute vowel *o* is *anudātta*, by P. 1.1.50. Then, given the sequene of *anudātta* and *udātta* in (..*māta*)*ro 'paḥ*, the present rule tells us that the *anudātta*, pitch of (...*māta*)*ro* is to be replaced by the pitch called *sannatara*.

In (2) the relevant pitch–sequence is that of (... *sarasva*)*ti śu*(*tudri*). The final *i* of *sarasvati* is *anudātta* by P. 8.1.19. The initial *u* of *śutudri* is

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

udātta. Since *śūtudri* occurs at the beginning of a *pāda*, it does not lose its accent by P. 8.1.18. Then, given the sequence of *anudātta* and *udātta* in (... *sarasva*)*ti śu*(*tudri*), the present rule tells us that the *anudātta* pitch of (... *sarasva*)*ti* is to be replaced by the pitch called *sannatara*.

In (3), which is the doubtful *laukika* example, the relevant pitch-sequence is (... *ādhyāpa*)*ka kva*. The form *jaṭilakādhyāpaka* is *ādyudātta* by P. 6.1.198 and P. 8.1.72. Therefore the syllable *ka* must be *anudātta*, by P. 6.1.158. *Kva* is *svarita* (see P. 1.2.32, under 8). Given the sequence of *anudātta* and *svarita* in (...)*ka kva*, the present rule tells us that the *anudātta* pitch of (...)*ka* is to be replaced by the pitch called *sannatara*.

1.2.41 APṚKTA EKĀL PRATYAYAḤ 'a suffix consisting of one single speechsound (is called) *apṛkta* '.

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. Contrary to Pāṇini's usual practice, here the *saṃjñā* comes first.

2. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya* any previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items have been cancelled. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

In fact, the present rule has nothing to do with either the previous or the following rules.

The *uddeśya* is *ekāl pratyayaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *apṛktaḥ*.

3. After defining a *pratyaya* as a linguistic element which comes after (a verbal base or a nominal stem) and which has the *udātta* pitch on the first syllable in P. 1.3.2–3, Pāṇini enumerates the elements concerned until the end of the fifth *adhyāya*.

Pratyayas are of rather different types : nominal stem derivative suffixes (*kṛt*, *taddhita*), case suffixes, fem. endings, *samāsānta* suffixes, finite verb endings, conjugation markers, modemarkers.

4. The term *apṛkta* literally means 'not mixed, combined', namely, with another speechsound. It is used as a technical term in the *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya* 1.54, and defined as *ekavarṇaḥ padam apṛktaḥ* 'a single speechsound which (by itself) forms a word (is called) *apṛkta* '. In the same text, 9.16, the particle *u* is called *apṛkta*.

Wherever the term *apṛkta* is used in the *A.* it refers to a single consonant. This single consonant may be there originally (P. 6.1.67, *v*; P. 7.3.96, a single consonant *sārvadhātuka* suffix), or be the result of deletion

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(P. 6.1.68, *t* and *s* after the application of P. 3.4.100; P. 7.3.91, a single consonant verb ending after the verbal base *ūrṇa*–). The better definition, therefore, would be *apṛkta ekahal pratyayaḥ* ' a suffix consisting of a single consonant (is called) *apṛkta* '.

5. Is the present rule required ? Or, to put it differently, can we manage without a definition of *apṛkta*, going just by its literal meaning of ' not combined ' ? Maybe we could. Still, to have the definition is not bad. But, for the rest, the definition is not theoretically important from the point of view of Pāṇini's *upadeśa*; the definition as stated is too broad; the place where it has been put is awkward; the mention of the *saṃjñā* first is un–Pāṇinian. Enough to make us doubt whether the rule formed part of the original body of rules of the *A*.

One more consideration may be added. P. 6.1.68 contains the expression *apṛktaṃ hal* ' a non–combined consonant (suffix) '. Obviously, this rule does not require the definition of *apṛkta*. We conclude that when P. 6.1.68 was phrased, P. 1.2.41 was not yet there, because otherwise P. 6.1.68 could have simply stated *apṛktam*.

6. Two of the examples quoted by the *KV* are *ghṛtaspṛk* ' one who touches ghee ', derived with the help of the *apṛkta* suffix *KviN* (P. 3.2.58), and *ardhabhāk* ' one who shares half '. The derivation of *ardhabhāk* is as follows :

(1)	(((*ardha* + *am*) + *bhaj*)) + *ṆVi*))) + *sU*	P. 4.1.2; 3.2.62; 4.1.2
(2)	(((*ardha* + °) + *bhaj*)) + *ṆVi*))) + *s*	P. 2.4.71
(3)	(((*ardha* + *bhaj*)) + °))) + *s*	P. 1.3.9; 1.3.2; 6.1.67
(4)	(((*ardha* + *bhaj*))) + °	P. 6.1.68
(5)	*ardhabhāj*	P. 7.2.116
(6)	*ardhabhāg*	P. 8.2.30; 1.1.50
(7)	*ardhabhāk*	P. 8.4.56
	ardhabhāk.	

1.2.42 TATPURUṢAḤ SAMĀNĀDHIKARAṆAḤ KARMADHĀRAYAḤ ' a *tatpuruṣa* (cp. the constituents of) which have a common referent (is called) *karmadhāraya* '.

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* is *tatpuruṣaḥ samānādhikaraṇaḥ* and comes first.

2. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya* any previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are cancelled. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The *uddeśya* is *tatpuruṣaḥ samānādhikaraṇaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *karmadhārayaḥ*.

3. The present rule is the first of a series of three rules which deal with compounds. These three rules have no connection with either the previous or following rules.

As explained by Joshi-Roodbergen 1983; p. 60-61, 71-72, 79-80, 82-83, and 91-92, the section dealing with cp.- formation - like the *taddhita*-section-comes from a different, non-Pāṇinian source.

4. The translation of the *sūtra* is in accordance with *Vt.* II on the present rule, as explained by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 214, line 6), *tātpuruṣaḥ samānādhikaraṇapadaḥ karmadhārayasaṃjño bhavati* 'a *tatpuruṣa* cp. formed of words which have a common referent is called *karmadhāraya* '.

The question was, how can a *tp.* cp., which as a cp. conveys one single meaning only, be said to be *samānādhikaraṇa* 'having a common referent' ? The answer as stated by Kātyāyana (*Vt.* II on the present rule) is that the common referent really belongs to the words which enter into the cp. as its constituents. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 214, lines 9-10) explains, *ayaṃ tatpuruṣo 'sty eva prāthamakalpiko yasminn aikapadyam aikasvaryam ekavibhaktitvaṃ ca* 'that *tp.* cp. which is one word, has one accent and one case ending definitely has to be formed first '. Therefore the qualifying word *samānādhikaraṇa* really belongs to a stage prior to that of the cp., namely, the stage of the wordgroup (*vākya*) which serves as the base for cp.-formation.

5. For the names *tatpuruṣa* and *karmadhāraya* see *BDA*, Introduction, p. vii and viii-x.

6. What is meant by *tatpuruṣa* is defined by enumeration, P. 2.1.22-2.2.22. The rules concerned are treated in detail in *ATA* 1969 (P. 2.1.2-49), *KA* 1971 (P. 2.1.51-72) and *TA* 1973 (P. 2.2.2-23).

The technical cp.-designations like *avyayībhāva*, *tatpuruṣa*, etc. are introduced in the section dealing with cp.-formation by way of *adhikāra* 'governing word '. However, there is no section devoted to *kdh.* cps as such.

7. The *KV* explains the meaning of *adhikaraṇa* in *samānādhikaraṇa* as *abhidheya* 'the thing referred to '. According to the *Nyāsa* here, *samāna* means *abhinna* 'non-different', that is, *eka* 'one and the same '. Thus *samānādhikaraṇa* is taken to mean 'having an identical referent '.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

8. Patañjali, in his *bhāṣya* on the present rule, does not offer any examples. The *KV* mentions *paramarājyam* 'the superior government', *uttamarājyam* 'the best government'. The *KV* also explains that, since these cps are *kdh.*, the accent rule P. 6.1.130 does not apply. The *Nyāsa* here states that the cps are formed by P. 2.1.61.

The other example offered by the *KV* is *pācakavṛndarikā* '(a woman) who is a cook and (at the same time) excellent', in short, an excellent cook. As explained by the *Nyāsa*, the cp. is formed by P. 2.1.62, and the point of the example is to demonstrate *puṃvadbhāva* 'treatment like a masculine form' of the constituent *pācaka* (instead of *pācikā*) in a *kdh.* cp. by P. 6.3.42. The counterexample here is the *bv.* cp. *pācikābhārya* 'one who has a wife who cooks'.

1.2.43 PRATHAMĀNIRDIṢṬAM SAMĀSA UPASARJANAM '(a word represented by a form) mentioned with a nominative case ending in (a rule dealing with) cp.–formation (is called) *upasarjana*'.

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* is *prathamānirdiṣṭaṃ samāse*, and comes first.

2. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya* any previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are cancelled. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

The *uddeśya* is *prathamānirdiṣṭam samāse*. The *vidheya* is *upasarjanam*.

3. *Prathamānirdiṣṭam* literally means '(a word) mentioned with a nominative case ending'. Then why has the translation been phrased differently? The point is that in the rules prescribing cp.–formation individual words may be mentioned in the nominative case (e. g., P. 1.2.25–27), but also categories of words (e. g., P. 1.2.19–20, P. 1.2.28, P. 1.2.30–38). The category may be one of meaning as in P. 1.2.28 (*kālāḥ* 'words denoting time') or of grammar, as in P. 1.2.30–38 (*tṛtīyā* 'ending in an instrumental case suffix', *caturthī* 'ending in a dative case suffix', *pañcamī* 'ending in an ablative case suffix'. Clearly, the categories represent words. Individual words also may be said to be represented by their own form (P. 1.1.68).

A word represented by a form in the nominative in a rule for cp.–formation takes the first place in a cp. by P. 2.2.30. Thus the term *upasarjana* becomes instrumental in determining the order of the constituents of *a* cp.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

4. As stated by Kātyāyana (*Vt.* II on the present rule) the word *samāse* is to be interpreted as *samāsavidhāne* 'in a rule prescribing cp.-formation'. The *KV* says the same in different words.

5. *Upasarjana* means 'subordinate'. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 215, lines 7–10) explains that a *saṃjñā* 'technical term / name' should be as short as possible, and that the point of lengthy designations (*mahatī saṃjñā*) lies in their being used in their etymological meaning. The opposite of *upasarjana* is *pradhāna* 'principal'. Both *upasarjana* and *pradhāna* are *saṃbandhiśabdas* 'correlative terms'. See further *ATA*, *Bh.* No. 2 on P. 2.1 6; *KA* Notes (132) and (133); and *BDA*, Introduction, p. xi–xii.

But does the term *upasarjana* always refer to a subordinate meaning ? Kaiyaṭa (on *Bh.* No. 8 on P. 1.2.43) mentions the cps *purvakāya* 'the front part of the body' (formed by P. 2.2.1), *ardhapippalī* 'half of a Piper longum' (formed by P. 2.2.2) and *puruṣavyāghra* 'a tiger–like man' (formed by P. 2.1.56). Here the constituents *pūrva*, *ardha* and *puruṣa* are represented by words in the nominative case in the respective rules. Yet they are not subordinate, as far as meaning is concerned. In fact, they are *pradhāna*. Therefore Kaiyaṭa concludes : *anvarthasaṃjñā hi yatra so 'rthaḥ saṃbhavati...anyatra tu vidhānasāmarthyān nirapekṣyā* 'for an etymologically significant name (applies) where that meaning is possible...but elsewhere (it applies) irrespective (of that meaning), on the strength of its prescription'.

What Kaiyaṭa says can be demonstrated with the help of the cp. called *avyayībhāva*. Here the indeclinable is the main (*pradhāna*) constituent of the cp. as far as meaning is coucerned. Still, it occupies the first place in the cp. Therefore the technical definition of *upasarjana* as a word mentioned in the nominative case in a rule prescribing cp.–formation is required, because going by the literal, *laukika* meaning of *upasarjana* one would obtain the wrong results.

6. The *KV* offers six examples, all of them prescribed by cp. formation rules containing a word denoting a case category in the nominative. They are :

a. *kaṣṭaśrita* 'who has taken trouble'. The cp. is formed by P. 2.1.24, which mentions the case category *dvitīyā* in the nominative. The cp. constituent *kaṣṭa* comes in this category. Therefore it is placed first in the cp.

b. *śaṅkulākhaṇḍa* 'a piece (made) by means of a nipper'. The cp. is formed by P. 2.1.30, which mentions the case category *tṛtīyā* in the nominative.

c. *yūpadāru* 'wood for (making) a stake'. The cp. is formed by P. 2.1.36, which mentions the case category *caturthī* in the nominative.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

d. *vṛkabhaya* 'fear of a wolf'. The cp. is formed by P. 2.1.37, which mentions the case category *pañcamī* in the nominative case.

e. *rājapuruṣa* 'a king's officer'. The cp. is formed by P. 2.2.8, which mentions the case category *ṣaṣṭhī* in the nominative.

f. *akṣaśaunda* 'cunning as regards dice'. The cp. is formed by P. 2.1.40, which mentions the case category *saptamī* in the nominative.

1.2.44 EKAVIBHAKTI CĀPŪRVANIPĀTE 'also (a word which in the corresponding wordgroup of the cp.) appears (throughout) with one and the same case ending (is called *upasarjana*), but not when the question is of occupying the first place (in a cp.)'.

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* is *ekavibhakti apūrvanipāte*, and comes first.

2. The word *upasarjana* is continued from the previous rule, because there is nothing to block it. The *KV* does not explicitly say which words are to be continued, but silently assumes that the term *samāse* is also continued. However, as explained by the *Nyāsa* here, the word *samāse* in P. 1.2.44 has a different meaning. It means *samāsārthe vākye* 'in the wordgroup conveying the meaning of the cp.', which is otherwise known as the *vigrahavākya* 'the meaning-analysis (of a cp.)'.

Any other previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are cancelled by the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya*. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

3. As stated earlier (P. 1.2.42, under 3), the sequence P. 1.2.42-44, which deals with technicalities of cp.-formation, has no connection with the preceding or following rules. Its proper place would be after P. 2.1.4. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 217-18.

4. The word *ca* is not required for purposes of *anuvṛtti* of the words *upasarjanam* or *samāse*, because these words are continued automatically. There is nothing to block them. Nor is *ca* required to indicate a rule-boundary. P. 1.2.43 and 44 must be different rules because they contain different *vidheyas*. Therefore the word *ca* is redundant.

5. The word *ekavibhakti* is a neuter *bv.* cp., as explained by the *KV*. The word supplied is *padam* 'finished word'. *Ekavibhakti* refers to that word in the corresponding wordgroup of the cp. which will invariably show the same case ending, however, much the case ending of the second word changes.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

For instance, the corresponding wordgroups for the cps *niṣkauśāmbiḥ* 'one who has left Kauśāmbī'. *niṣkauśāmbim* 'one (sg. acc. masc.) who has left Kauśāmbi' or *niṣkauśāmbinā* 'by one who has left Kauśāmbi' are *kauśāmbyāḥ niṣkrāntaḥ*, *kauśāmbyāḥ niṣkrāntam* and *kauśāmbyāḥ niṣkrāntena* respectively. Here the form *kauśāmbyāḥ* remains identical. Therefore, by P. 1.2.44 it will be called *upasarjana*. Consequently, the fem. ending *ī* of *kauśāmbī* will be shortened by P. 1.2.48. See *SA*, Note (146). We note that the case ending of the cp. as a whole is identical with that of the second word (*niṣkrānta*) of the wordgroup. Cp.–formation takes place by *Vt.* IV on P. 2.2.18, and, in detail, by *Śaunāgavt.* I[9]. See *TA*, p. 188, 195.

6. The *KV* explains the word *pūrvanipāta* as *pūrvanipātākhyam upasarjanakāryam* 'the grammatical operation (prescribed) for (a word called) *upasarjana*, namely, *pūrvanipāta* "occupying the first place (in a cp.)"'. Reference is to P. 2.2.30. The point of the condition *apūrvanipāte* is explained by the *KV* with the help of the form *kauśāmbīnis*. Since *kauśāmbī* is called *upasarjana*, and since P. 2.2.30 prescribes the first place in a cp. for the word called *upasarjana*, we would derive the undesired form *kauśāmbīnis*. This is, however, prevented by the condition *apūrvanipāte* in P. 1.2.44. Or, in other words, for deciding the order of the constituents in a cp. with an *ekavibhakti* word the designation *upasarjana* plays no role whatsoever.

7. Kātyāyana, in *Vt.* III on the present rule, sums up four aims of the rule. It becomes effective in the formation of *dvigu* cps, in the formation of cps with the words *prāpta* and *āpanna*, in the formation of cps with *alam*, and in the formation of cps with *upasargas* which convey the sense of a participle form ending in *Kta*. The examples supplied by Patañjali are respectively *pañcaguḥ*, derived from *pañcabhir gobhiḥ krītaḥ* 'bought for five cows' (P. 2.1.51; P. 5.1.37; P. 5.1.28); *prāptajīvikaḥ*, derived from *prāpto jīvikām* 'who has obtained a means of living' (P. 2.2.4); *alaṃkumāriḥ*, derived from *alaṃ kumāryai* 'fit for (marrying) a young girl' (*Śaunāgavt.* H[8] on P. 2.2.18; see *TA*, P. 194–95); and *niṣkauśāmbiḥ*, derived from *kauśāmbyāḥ niṣkrāntaḥ* (*Śaunāgavt.* I[9]; see *TA*, p. 195).

The point is that in these cps each time both constituents are called *upasarjana*, whether by P. 1.2.43 or 44. Then the order of the constituents is decided by the mention in the nominative case in the rule prescribing the cp. concerned. Moreover, shortening of the final vowel of *go* and stems ending in a fem. suffix takes place by P. 1.2.48. For instance, in *pañcagu* both *pañca* and *go* are called *upasarjana*, because they are *ekavibhakti*. But *pañca* takes the first

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

place, because it comes under the nominative term *saṃkhyāpūrvaḥ* in P. 2.1.55. The final *o* of *go* is shortened by P. 1.2.48, which applies when *go* is *upasarjana*. Thus the application of the name *upasarjana* to both constituents of the cp. has different effects for each constituent.

1.2.45 ARTHAVAD ADHĀTUR APRATYAYAḤ PRĀTIPADIKAM '(a linguistic form) which is meaningful (but) not a verbal base (and) different from a suffix (is called) *prātipadika* " nominal stem " '.

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* is *arthavad adhātur apratyayaḥ*, and comes first.

2. The present rule forms part of a sequence of three rules, P. 1.2.45–47, which has no connection with the preceding or following rules.

By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya* any previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are cancelled. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

The *uddeśya* is *arthavad adhātur apratyayaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *prātipadikam*.

3. Since the next rule, P. 1.2.46, deals with the designation *prātipadika* for nominal stems which are derived within Pāṇini's system, and would have sufficed, if all nominal stems had been derivable by rule, it follows that the present rule, P. 1.2.45, assigns the name *prātipadika* to underivable (*avyutpanna*) nominal stems. Underivability means that a nominal stem cannot be analysed into a verbal base plus a primary (*kṛt*) word–derivative suffix.

Yāska, in *Nirukta* 1.12, notes two views regarding the derivability of nominal stems. One view, attributed to Śākaṭāyana and others, holds that all nominal stems are derivable with the help of stem–suffix analysis (*vyutpatti/ vyutpanna–pakṣa*). The other view, attributed to Gārgya and others, holds that not all nominal stems are derivable (*avyutpatti / avyutpanna–pakṣa*). The first view is also that of the *nairuktas* 'etymologists' and of the school of grammarians from which the *uṇādisūtras* (compare P. 3.3.1; 3.4.75) originated See *TA*, fn. 468 and *PASPA*, Note (4). As represented by P. 1.2.45–46, Pāṇini's view is that of Gārgya.

4. What does the word *arthavat* mean ? Does the word *artha* here stand for what is usually called lexical meaning (in Indian tradition, the item referred to), or also for non–lexical, grammatical–categorical meaning ? Apparently, the use of the term *arthavat* by itself is not sufficient to exclude meanings conveyed by suffixes from the definition of *prātipadika*. It appears therefore

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

that *artha* may denote both types of meanings. This is confirmed by seeing the use of the word *artha* in the *A*.

The word *arthavat* is neuter. We have to supply a word like *śabdasvarūpam* 'a word-form / linguistic form'. The words *adhātuḥ* and *apratyayaḥ*, on the other hand, are masculine. How to construe them ?

Traditionally, the cps *adhātuḥ* and *apratyayaḥ* are taken to be negative *tp*. cps whose gender is fixed by P. 2.4.26. They are construed with *arthavat* as nouns in apposition. This is also the interpretation adopted in the translation of the rule. It amounts to saying that a meaningful linguistic form with the exception of a verbal base or a suffix is called *prātipadika*, which is how the *KV* explains the rule.

In passing, it may be noted that, in order to cover *avyutpanna* nominal stems, the clearer definition would have been *arthavad adhātu apratyayaṃ prātipadikam* 'a meaningful (linguistic form) which has / shows no (discernable) verbal base (and) which does not end in a suffix (is called) *prātipadika*'. Here the cps *adhātu* and *apratyaya* are neuter *bv*. cps, agreeing with *arthavat*. If there is no (discernable) verbal base, there can be no primary stem-derivative (*kṛt*) suffix. Thus, by the mention of *adhātu*, *kṛt*-suffixes become automatically included. For the question, how the *bv*. cp. *adhātu* 'not possessing a *dhātu*' can refer to what is a *dhātu*, see *PASPA*, fn. 739, and P. 1.1.21, under 4.

5. By the word *arthavat* speechsounds (*varṇa*) are excluded. Kātyāyana, in *Vt. X* on the present rule, referring back to *Vts* XIV and XV on *Śivasūtra* 5 (*Mbh*. I, p. 31), says that much. Patañjali, in his *bhāṣya* on *Vt*. XI, explains that wholes or groups of speechsounds may be meaningful, but never the speechsounds taken separately. He illustrates this by saying (*Mbh*. I, p. 220, lines 22–24) *yathā tarhi rathāṅgāni vihṛtāni pratyekaṃ vrajikriyāṃ praty asamarthāni bhavanti tatsamudāyaś ca rathaḥ samartha evam eṣāṃ varṇānāṃ samudāya arthavanto 'vayavā anarthakā iti* 'then, just as the parts of a chariot, when taken apart each singly are incapable of moving, but the chariot which is the whole of them is capable (to do so), in the aame way the wholes (formed) of speechsounds are meaningful (but) the parts have no meaning'. For details see *The Sphoṭanirṇaya of Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa*. Edited...by S. D. Joshi. Poona 1967, General Introduction, p. 2–5.

6. *Adhātuḥ* taken as a *tp*. cp. means *na dhātuḥ* 'not a verbal base'. What is understood by *dhātu* is defined by P. 1.3.1, namely, the verbal bases *bhū*–, etc., as enumerated in the *Dhātupāṭha*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

7. *Apratyayaḥ* taken as a *tp.* cp. means *yad anyat pratyayāt* 'what is other than a *pratyaya*' (*Mbh.* I, p. 221, line 11). For what is understood by *pratyaya* see P. 1.2.41, under 3.

According to the *SK* (No. 178 on P. 1.2.45), the term *pratyaya* here also stands for *pratyayānta* 'ending in a *pratyaya*'. But this double interpretation is not required, because, by *PN*, *pb.* 23, we know that in grammar the term *pratyaya* denotes a wordform which begins with that to which the *pratyaya* has been added, and which ends with that *pratyaya*.

8. In *Vt.* IV on the present rule Kātyāyana proposes that a prohibition like *adhātuḥ* or *apratyayaḥ* should also be phrased for a *vākya* 'sentence'. One example provided by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 217, line 25) is *devadatta gām abhyāja śuklām* 'Devadatta, bring the white cow'. Since a sentence is a meaningful whole, is not a verbal base and is different from a suffix or from what ends in a suffix, the designation *prātipadika* would apply. But the proposal is rejected by *Vt.* VI. The argument is as follows. The word *samāsa* in the next rule, P. 1.2.46, is not really required. We can have the designation *prātipadika* for a cp. by P. 1.2.45. For instance, the cp. stem *rājapuruṣa* technically analysed as ((*rājan* + *Ṅas*) + (*puruṣa* + *sU*)) is meaningful, it is not a verbal base, it is different from a suffix, and, taken as a whole, it does not end in a suffix. Therefore the designation *prātipadika* applies. Then what is the point in stating the word *samāsa* in P. 1.2.46 again ? The re-statement (*punarukti*, *punaḥśruti*) of this word in this rule is taken to have an emphatic or restrictive value : *samāsa eva* 'a compound only'. That is to say, if the designation *prātipadika* is to apply to a meaningful whole consisting of *padas* 'finished words', and which is not a *dhātu* and is different from a *pratyaya* or what ends in that, it applies to *samāsa* only. Thereby a *vākya* is excluded.

9. Kātyāyana, in *Vt.* XII on the present rule, says that the designation *prātipadika* is to be given also to particular non-meaningful linguistic elements, namely, to *nipātas* (defined by P. 1.4.56, ff.). The examples provided by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 220, line 26 – p. 221. line 1) are *khañjati*|*nikhañjati* 'he limps' and *lambate*|*pralambate* 'it hangs down'. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 221, lines 2–3) mentions two purposes of the *Vt.* First, it enables us to add case endings to *nipātas* by way of general procedure. The ending are subsequently deleted by P. 1.1.37 and P. 2.4.82. Secondly, it enables us to account for the loss of the *udātta* pitch by P. 8.1.16–17 and P. 8.1.28.

10. The examples offered by the *KV* are all of them underivable (*avyutpanna*) substantives, *ḍittha* (a name), *kapittha* 'Feronia Elephantum', *kuṇḍa* 'pitcher', and *pīṭha* 'seat'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The counterexamples are taken from Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 217, lines 1, 3 and 7), as follows :

a. for *arthavat*

The designation *prātipadika* cannot become applicable to the sound-sequences *v–a–n* and *dh–a–n* in the words *vanam* and *dhanam*, because they are meaningless. If this designation had become applicable here, it would lead us to delete the *n*, by P. 8.2.7.

b. for *adhātuḥ*

The designation *prātipadika* cannot become applicable to the finite verb *ahan* 'he killed'. This form has the designation *dhātu*, because it is derived from the verbal base *han–*, which has been mentioned in the *Dhātupāṭha*. If the name *prātipadika* had become applicable here, it would lead us to delete the final *n*, by P. 8.2.7.

c. for *apratyayaḥ*.

The designation *prātipadika* cannot become applicable to forms like *kāṇḍe* 'in a part/the two parts', or *kuḍye* 'in the wall', which are forms ending in a *pratyaya*. In fact, *kāṇḍe* taken as a locative form is derived from *kāṇḍa* + *Ṅi*, by P. 6.1.87. Here the single substitute *e* inherits the property *pratyayatva* 'being a *pratyaya*' from the *i* of the original case ending, by P. 6.1.85. Therefore the form *kāṇḍe* is *pratyayānta*. If the designation *prātipadika* had become applicable here, it would lead us to shorten the final *e* by P. 1.2.47.

1.2.46 KṚTTADDHITASAMĀSĀŚ CA 'also (a stem ending in) a *kṛt* (–suffix) or (a stem ending in) a *taddhita*(–suffix) and a compound (–stem) (is called *prātipadika*) '.

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* is *kṛttaddhitasamāsāḥ*.

2. The word *prātipadikam* is continued from P. 1.2.45. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* any previous *uddeśya* items have been cancelled.

The *uddeśya* is *kṛttaddhitasamāsāḥ*. The *vidheya* is *prātipadikam*.

3. The word *ca* being neither required for the *anuvṛtti* of the word *prātipadikam*, nor as a boundary marker, is redundant.

If a rule deals with *taddhita*–suffixes or with *samāsa*, in a number of cases a redundant *ca* is added. For instance, P. 1.1.38; P. 1.1.41.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

4. The words *kṛt* and *taddhita* are interpreted to mean *kṛdanta* 'ending in a *kṛt*(–suffix) ' and *taddhitānta* 'ending in a *taddhita*(–suffix) ' by *PN. pb.* 23.

The suffixes called *kṛt* are defined by enumeration, from P. 3.1.93–3.4.76. The suffixes called *taddhita* are also defined by enumeration, from P. 4.1.75–5.4.160.

5. P. 1.2.3–4 tell us that the form resulting from the joining of two semantically and syntactically connected case–inflected nouns, as prescribed by the rules up to P. 2.2.38, is called *samāsa*. For the special point of the mention of the term *sāmāsa* in P. 1.2.46 see P. 1.2.45, under 8.

6. Whereas P. 1.2.45 covers underivable (*avyutpanna*) nominal stems (see P. 1.2.45, under 3), the present rule covers derivable nominal stems. As stated by the *KV*, after the exclusion (of *pratyayānta* words) by the term *apratyayaḥ* in P. 1.2.45, the present rule specifically assigns the designation *prātipadika* to words ending in a *kṛt*–or *taddhita*–suffix.

7. The *KV* offers more than one example for each category mentioned in the rule. The grammatical operation triggered off by the designation *prātipadika* in all these cases is the addition of case endings, by P. 1.4.2.

1.2.47 HRASVO NAPUṂSAKE PRĀTIPADIKASYA 'a short vowel comes in the place of (the long final vowel of) a *prātipadika* " nominal stem ", when used in the neuter '.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* which lays down a rule for substitution by which a vowel becomes shortened.

2. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya* any previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are cancelled. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

The *uddeśya* is *napuṃsake prātipadikasya*. The *vidheya* is *hrasvaḥ*.

3. The term *hrasva* has been introduced and defined by P. 1.2.27. According to P. 1.2.28, when the question is of substituting a *hrasva*, etc. vowel we have to supply the word *acaḥ* 'in the place of a vowel '. Therefore the genitive *prātipadikasya* is to be interpreted as *prātipadikasya acaḥ* 'in the place of the (final) vowel of a *prātipadika* '.

4. The word *prātipadikasya* has been explicitly stated in the rule, because the nominative word *prātipadikam* in P. 1.2.46 functions as the *vidheya*, whereas the genitive word *prātipadikasya* is part of the *uddeśya* in P. 1.2.47.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Moreover, in connection with a *vidheya*, *vibhaktivipariṇāma* 'change of case ending (into another case ending)' never takes place. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 225.

The word *prātipadikasya* (see under 3) is further interpreted as *prātipadikasya antyasya acaḥ* 'in the place of the final vowel of a *prātipadika*' by the *pb*. P. 1.1.52.

5. For the term *napuṃsake* see P. 1.1.43, under 4. The *KV* makes it clear that the word *napuṃsake* in the present rule does not stand for its own form (P. 1.1.68), but for a meaning, namely, the neuter gender.

However, if *napuṃsaka* is taken to mean a neuter case ending (see P. 1.1.43, under 1), the question is, how to interpret the locative form *napuṃsake*? In this case, *napuṃsake* may be taken as a technical locative (P. 1.1.66), in the sense of 'when a neuter case ending immediately follows'. Thus P. 1.2.47 comes to mean that shortening takes place of the final vowel of a *prātipadika* before a neuter case ending. The result of this interpretation is the same as that of the interpretation adopted in the translation given above.

6. The better phrasing of the rule would have been *tasya napuṃsake hrasvaḥ* 'for (the final vowel) of that (*prātipadika*) a short vowel is substituted'.

7. The examples offered by the *KV* are based on *Śaunāgavt*. F[6] (see *TA*, p. 194), which makes the Pāṇinian origin of the rule itself doubtful.

1.2.48 GOSTRIYOR UPASARJANASYA '(a short vowel comes) in the place of (the final vowel of a *prātipadika* "nominal stem" ending in the word) *go* "cow" or (in a word itself ending in) a fem. suffix (which occur) as *upasarjana* (members of a cp.)'.

1, This is a *vidhisūtra* which lays down a rule for substitution whereby a final vowel becomes shortened.

2. The words *hrasvaḥ* and *prātipadikasya* are continued from P. 1.2.47. Any other previous *uddeśya* or *vidheya* item is cancelled by the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya*.

The *uddeśya* is *prātipadikasya gostriyor upasarjanasya*. The *vidheya* is *hrasvaḥ*.

3. For the interpretation of the supplied form *prātipadikasya* see P. 1.2.47 under 4. We note that P. 1.2.46 assigns the name *prātipadika* to a cp. stem also.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

4. As explained by the *KV*, the item *go* in *gostriyoḥ* stands for its own form, by P. 1.1.68, but the item *strī* does not. Here *strī* does not stand for the word *stṛī* 'woman', but for *strīpratyaya* 'fem. suffix'.

The section dealing with fem. suffixes is headed by the the rule *striyām* (P. 4.1.3). A governing word in a rule is marked with *svarita*, by P. 1.3.11. To explain that the item *strī* in *gostriyoḥ* refers to a (word ending in a) fem. suffix, Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 224, line 2) says that it is marked with *svarita*. This is a mere *ad hoc* explanation designed to have the desired status of *strīpratyaya* for the word *strī* in *gostriyoḥ*, and therefore worthless. Instead, recourse may be had to *PN*, *pb.* 102, which says that when a word in a *sūtra* leaves us the choice between taking it as a *pratyaya* or as a non-*pratyaya*, we should take it as a *pratyaya*.

5. The word *gostriyoḥ*, functions as the qualifier of the supplied word *prātipadikasya*. For the peculiar construction of a dual form qualifying a sg. noun recourse may be had to *PN*, *pb.* 73, which says that in a *sūtra* gender and number are not specifically intended as such. Here, as stated by the *KV*, the *tadantavidhi* becomes applicable. Accordingly, we interpret the *dvandva* cp. *gostriyoḥ* as *gośabdāntasya strīpratyayāntasya ca* '(in the place of ... a *prātipadika*) which ends in the word *go* or in (a word itself ending in) a fem. suffix '.

6. As explained by the *KV*, the word *upasarjanasya* qualifies *gostriyoḥ*. For the construction see the reference to *PN*, *pb.* 73, under note 5. Since the term *upasarjana* is a *saṃjñā*, the *tadantavidhi* does not apply.

The designation *upasarjana* mentioned in the present rule may become applicable by either P. 1.2.43 (*prathamānirdiṣṭam*) or by P. 1.2.44 (*ekavibhakti*), depending on the examples.

7. Two examples offered for P. 1.2.48 by the *KV* are *citragus* 'one who owns brindled cows' and *niṣkauśāmbis* 'one who has departed from *Kauśāmbī*'. For the latter example see P. 1.2.44, under 5. Here the designation *upasarjana* becomes applicable by P. 1.2.44 (*ekavibhakti*). The word *citragus* is derived as follows :

(1)	((*citrā* + *Jas*) + (*go* + *Jas*)) *ap.*	+ *sU*	P. 2.2.24; 1.2.46
(2)	((*citrā* + °) + (*go* + °))	+ *s*	P. 2.4.71
(3)	(*citra* + *go*)	+ *s*	P. 6.3.34
(4)	*citragu*	+ *s*	P. 1.2.48; 1.1.48
	citragus.		

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The word *go* here is technically called *upasarjana* by P. 1.2.43 (*prathamānirdiṣṭam*), in accordance with the mention of *anekam* in the nominative case in the rule prescribing *bv.* cp.–formation (P. 2.2.24). See also *BDA*, fn. 112.

8. Kātyāyana, in *Vt.* III on the present rule, phrases an exception to the shortening prescribed. The *Vt.* says *īyaso bahuvrīhau puṃvadvacanam* ' a statement regarding (treatment) like a masculine form (is to be made) for (a word ending in the suffix) *īyas* (occurring as the final member) in a *bahuvrīhi* (cp.) '. One of the examples quoted by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 224, lines 8–9), and borrowed by the *KV* is *bahuśreyasī* ' (a country) having many more righteous women '. It is derived as follows :

(1)	((*bahvī* + *Jas*) + (*śreyasī* + *Jas*))	*ap.* + *sU*	P. 2.2.24; 1.2.46
(2)	((*bahvī* + •) + (*śreyasī* + °))	+ *s*	P. 2.4.71
(3)	(*bahu* + *śreyasī*)	+ *s*	P. 6.3.34
(4)	*bahuśreyasī*	+ °	P. 6.1.68
(5)	*bahuśreyasī*		*Vt.* III on P. 1.2.48

bahuśreyasī.

The point is that *Vt.* III on the present rule prohibits the shortening of the final *ī* here. By this *Vt.* as phrased by Kātyāyana the fem. suffix *ṄīP*, added after *śreyas* by P. 4.1.6 is treated as a masculine. Therefore P. 1.2.48 (*strīpratyaya*) cannot apply.

We note that the *Vt.* is slightly differently phrased by the *KV*. The *KV* leaves out the word *puṃvadvacanam* and replaces it by *pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ* ' a prohibition should be phrased '. Thus no reference to *puṃvadbhāva* ' treatment like a masculine form ' is made here.

1.2.49 LUK TADDHITALUKI ' given *luk*(–deletion) of a *taddhita*(–suffix, then) *luk*(–deletion of the fem. suffix belonging to the constituent which is *upasarjana* " subordinate " also takes place) '.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing *luk*–deletion of a fem. suffix.

2. As stated by the *KV*, the constituent *strī* in *gostriyoḥ*, interpreted as *stripratyaya* ' fem. suffix ', and the word *upasarjanasya* from P. 1.2.48 are continued. Any other previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are cancelled by the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The *uddeśya* is *taddhitaluki*. The *vidheya* is *upasarjanasya strīpratyayasya luk*.

3. *Luk* is one of the terms used to denote deletion of a suffix. See P. 1.1.61.

For *taddhita* see P. 1.2.46, under 4, and, for some general observations in this respect, Joshi– Roodbergen 1983, p. 68, 74–75.

4. As explained by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 225, lines 20–21), the locative *taddhitaluki* is not an instance of a *parasaptamī* ' locative case ending indicating a following item as the condition for a grammatical operation ' (see *KA*, fn. 1), but a *satsaptamī*, that is, a locative absolute.

5. The word *upasarjana* continued in the present rule is not used in its technical sense, as defined by P. 1.2.43–44. It means ' subordinate ', and it refers to a meaning which is subordinate to that of the *taddhita*–suffix which is deleted.

6. One of the examples offered by the *KV* (taken from Patañjali, *Mbh.* I, p. 153, line 22, *bhāṣya* on *Vt.* II on P. 1.1.58) is *pañcendraḥ*. As stated by Patañjali in the passage referred to, the word means *pañcendrāṇyo devatā asya* ' whose deities are the five Indrāṇī's .

The word *indrāṇī* is derived from *indra* with the help of the augment *ānUK* and the fem. suffix *ṄīṢ*, by P. 4.1.49. Then the derivation of *pañcendras*, as explained by the *Nyāsa* here, is as follows :

(1)	(((*pañcan* + *Jas*) + (*indrāṇī* + *Jas*)) + *aṆ*))) + *sU*	P. 2.1.51; 4.2.24; 1.2.46; 4.1.2
(2)	(((*pañcan* + °) + (*indrāṇī* + °)) + *a*))) + *s*	P. 2.4.71
(3)	(((*pañcan* + *indrāṇī*)) + °))) + *s*	P. 4.1.88
(4)	(*pañcan* + *indra*°) + *s*	P. 1.2.49 *PN, pb.* 86
(5)	(*pañca*° + *indra*) + *s*	P. 8.2.7
(6)	*pañcendra* + *s*	P. 6.1.87
	pañcendras.	

In stage (4) P. 1.2.49 is applied, which prescribes the *luk*–deletion of the fem. suffix *ṄīṢ* in the form quoted. This deletion is conditioned by the deletion of the *taddhita*–suffix *aṆ*, which has taken place in stage (3).

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Moreover, in stage (4), when *ṄīṢ* goes, the augment *ānUK* also goes, according to *pb.* 86. This *pb.* says that when of two items introduced together by a rule, one is deleted, the other also disappears.

After the application of the *tripādī* rule P. 8.2.7 the application of the non-*tripādī* rule P. 6.1.87 is allowed by P. 8.2.2.

7. One more example offered by the *KV* is *āmalakam* derived in the sense of *āmalakyāḥ phalam* 'the fruit of an *āmalakī* tree'. This example too is taken from Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 153, line 14). First it should be explained that the word *āmalakī* is formed with the fem. suffix *ṄīṢ*, by P. 4.1.41 (*āmalaka* is No. 18 in the *gaurādigaṇa*). Then the derivation of *āmalakam* in the sense indicated is as follows :

(1)	((*āmalakī* + *Ṅas*) + *mayaṬ*)) + *sU*	P. 4.3.144; 1.2.46; 4.1.2
(2)	((*āmalakī* + °) + *maya*)) + *s*	P. 2.4.71
(3)	(*āmalakī* + °) + *s*	P. 4.3.163
(4)	*āmalaka* + *s*	P. 1.4.49
(5)	*āmalaka* + *am*	P. 7.1.24
(6)	*āmalakam*	P. 6.1.107
	āmalakam.	

8. We note the following inconsistencies in the present rule :

(a) A constituent of a *dvandva* cp., namely, *strī*, is continued singly from the preceding rule. This goes against Pāṇinian practice. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 249.

(b) The use of the term *upasarjana* in its non–technical sense, after it has been used in its technical sense in the preceding rule.

(c) The derivation of the examples like *pañcendra* and *āmalakam* appears to be very artificial. The same point is also raised by P. 1.2.53, q. v.

It may, therefore, be maintained that P. 1.2.49 comes from a non–Pāṇinian source.

1.2.50 ID GOṆYĀḤ '(given *luk*–deletion of a *taddhita*–suffix) short *i* comes in the place of (the final of) *goṇī* "a measure (for weighing corn)", (when occurring as an *upasarjana* word)'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* which lays down an exception to P. 1.2.49. Whereas the previous rule prescribes the total deletion of the fem. suffix of an *upasarjana* word, the present rule prescribes the substitution of short *i* for long *ī* in the case of *goṇī*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

2. The words *upasarjanasya* and *taddhitaluki* are continued from P. 1.2.48 and 49. Any other previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are cancelled by the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya*.

The *uddeśya* is *upasarjanasya goṇyāḥ taddhitaluki*. The *vidheya* is *it*.

3. The word *it* stands for short *i*, by P. 1.1.70.

4. One of the examples offered by the *KV* (taken from Patañjali, *Mbh*. I, p. 226, line 3) is *pañcagaṇiḥ*. Its meaning is explained by the *KV* as *pañcabhir goṇībhiḥ krītaḥ paṭaḥ* 'a piece of cloth bought for five *goṇīs*'. The derivation is as follows :

(1)	(((*pañcan* + *bhis*) + (*goṇī* + *bhis*)) + *ṬHaK*))) + *sU*	P. 5.1.19; 5.1.37 1.2.46; 4.1.2
(2)	(((*pañcan* + °) + (*goṇī* + °)) + *a*))) + *s*	P. 2.4.71
(3)	(((*pañcan* + *goṇī*)) + °))) + *s*	P. 5.1.28
(4)	(*pañcan* + *goṇi*) + *s*	P. 1.2.50
(5)	(*pañca* ° + *goṇi*) + *s*	P. 8.2.7
	pañcagoṇis.	

In stage (4) P. 1.2.50 is applied for shortening of the final *ī* of *goṇī*. This shortening is conditioned by the deletion of the *taddhita*-suffix *thaK* in stage (3).

5. Following a lead of a *ślokavārttikakāra* (*Mbh*. I, p. 226, lines 11 and 14), which practically amounts to a proposal of *yogavibhāga* 'the splitting up of the rule', the *KV* mentions the possibility of *yogavibhāga*. That is to say, we will read P. 1.2.50 as two rules, namely, (a) *it*, and (b) *goṇyāḥ*. By rule (a) we have a general prescription of the substitution of short *i* for long *ī*, by which we can justify forms like *pañcasūciḥ* 'bought for five needles'. By rule (b) we have a special prescription for shortening in the case of *goṇī*, which invariably applies.

Generally, in the case of *yogavibhāga*, the (a) rule is intended for a wider application, so that it will cover more examples. But it has to be kept in mind that this (a) rule is not meant to make other rules redundant. *Yogavibhāga* is meant for *iṣṭasiddhi* 'the establishing of desired forms', not for *aniṣṭasiddha* 'the establishing of undesired cases'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.2.51 LUPI YUKTAVAD VYAKTIVACANE 'given *lup*(=deletion of a *taddhita*– suffix, then) the gender and number (of the derivative word) are like (those of) the original noun–base'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* which lays down a rule for the gender and number of a *taddhita*– derivative.

2. As stated by the *KV*, the rule can be interpreted in two ways, depending on whether we read *yuktavadvyaktivancane* as one word or as two words. In the first case, *yuktavadvyaktivacane* is a *tp*. cp. in which *yuktavat* is a past active participle in the sense of 'that which has connected'. Thus *yuktavadvyaktivacane* comes to mean 'the gender and number of (the form) which has connected (itself with the meaning of a *taddhita*–suffix)'. In the second case, *yuktavat* is a word ending in the suffix *vatI*, by P. 5.1.115.

In the first interpretation, the form *yuktavadvyaktivacane* is itself the *vidheya*. In the second interpretation, the *vidheya* is *yuktavat*. The translation of the rule given above follows the second interpretation which has been clearly adopted by Kātyāyana, in *Vt*. I on the present rule, and by Patañjali, witness his use of the term *yuktavadbhāva* 'treatment like the (original) noun–base' (*Mbh*. I, p. 227, line 8).

3. The word *lupi* cancels *taddhitaluki* from P. 1.2.50. Any other previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are also cancelled by the introduction of a new incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya*.

The *uddeśya* is *lupi vyaktivacane*. The *vidheya* is *yuktavat*.

4. In the *A*. suffixes are deleted with the help of three terms, enumerated by P. 1.1.61. Out of these three, the use of *lup* is restricted to the deletion of *taddhita*–suffixes. See Joshi–Roodbergen 1983, p. 68.

Like *taddhitaluki*, in P. 1.2.49, the form *lupi* in the present rule is also a *satsaptamī*. See P. 1.2.49, under 4.

5. The term *yuktavat* occurs in the *A*. only here. Literally, *yukta* means 'connected'. Reference is to the *prakṛti*, the stem, the original noun–base, which is connected with a *taddhita*–meaning.

6. The terms *vyakti* and *vacana* are used in the sense of gender and number in the *A*. only here. For *vacana* see *PRATI*, fn. 2, and *Bh*. Nos 13–16 on P. 2.3.46.

7. One of the examples quoted by the *KV* is *pañcālāḥ*. The word *pañcālāḥ*, as explained by the *Nyāsa* here, is to be derived in two stages, as follows :

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

A.	(1) ((*pañcāla* + *Ṅas*) + *aÑ*)) + *sU*	P. 4.1.168; 4.1.174; 1.2.46; 4.1.2
	(2) ((*pañcāla* + °) + *a*)) + *s*	P. 2.4.71
	(3) ((*pañcāla* + °)) + *s*	P. 2.4.62
	pañcālas.	

The sense in which the word *pañcālas* is derived is 'the descendant of a *pañcāla*, who happens to be a *rājā*'. In stage (3) the *taddhita*-suffix *aÑ* is *luk*-deleted (*luk*, P. 2.4.58).

B.	(1) ((*pañcala* + *am*) + *aṆ*)) + *Jas*	P. 4.2.69, 1.2.46; 4.1.2
	(2) ((*pañcāla* +) + *a*)) + *as*	P. 2.4.71
	(3) (*pañcāla* +) + *as*	P. 4.2.81
	(4) *pañcālās*	P. 6.1.102
	(5) *pañcālās*	P. 1.2.51
	pañcālās.	

In stage (1) the pl. genitive ending is added to the noun-base *pañcāla* and the pl. nominative ending to the form to be derived as a whole, to allow the operation of P. 1.2.51. This rule requires the agreement in (gender and) number. P. 1.2.51 is applied in stage (5). It is conditioned by the *lup*-deletion of the *taddhita*-suffix *aṆ* in stage (3). We note that the use of *lup* prevents any operations based on the deleted suffix (like *vṛddhi*, by P. 7.2.117).

The sense in which the word *pañcālās* is derived this time is that of a region (*janapada*; see V. S. Agrawala 1963, p. 426–28) inhabited by the *pañcāla kṣatriyas*.

8. The present rule deals with *lup*-deletion. Therefore a counterexample would be the form *āmalakam* 'the fruit of the *āmalakī* tree', for which see P. 1.2.49, under 7. In the derivation of *amalakam* the *taddhita*-suffix (*mayaṬ*) is *luk*-deleted. Therefore P. 1.2.51 does not apply, and we derive the neuter derivative *āmalakam* from the fem. noun-base *āmalakī*.

9. As noted by the *KV*, the present rule is rejected by P. 1.2.53. The point made by this rule is that the question of gender and number is decided by usage. It lies outside the realm of grammar, unless it can be shown that it is grammatically conditioned, as stated by P. 2.4.1 ff. Compare also Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 390, lines 18–19) *liṅgam aśiṣyaṃ lokāśrayatvāl liṅgasya* 'gender is not to be taught (by grammar), because gender depends on usage'.

10. We note the following inconsistncies in the present rule :

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(a) The use of terms, *vyakti* and *vacana*, which, in the meaning denoted, are used nowhere else in the *A*.

(b) The teaching of gender and number, which according to P. 1.2.53, lies outside the realm of grammar.

(c) The teaching of *lup*–deletion (restricted to the *taddhita*–section), which, according to P. 1.2.54, is not to be taught, because the meaning–relationship posited by the (deleted) *taddhita*–suffix and the original noun–base is not at all clear. That is to say, the grammatical procedure adopted here is doubtful. See Joshi– Roodbergen 1983, p. 68.

It may, therefore, be maintained that P. 1.2.51, like P. 1.2.49, comes from a non–Pāṇinian source.

11. The *KV* adds two *vārttikas*, which are actually *Vts* III and IV on P. 1.2.52. If it is accepted that gender and number are decided by usage (as P. 1.2.53 points out), these *vārttikas*, like P. 1.2.51–52, are not required.

1.2.52 VIŚEṢAṆĀNĀṂ CĀJĀTEḤ 'also (given *lup*–deletion, then the gender and number) of qualifying words which do not refer to a *jāti* (are like those of the original noun–base) '.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* which lays down a rule for syntactic agreement in gender and number between a qualifying word and a *taddhita*–derived qualified word.

2. The whole previous rule, *lupi yuktavad vyaktivacane*, is continued.

The *uddeśya* is *viśeṣaṇānāṃ lupi vyaktivacane ajāteḥ*. The *vidheya* is *yuktavat*.

3. The expression *viśeṣaṇānām ajāteḥ* literally means 'of *viśeṣaṇas* which are other than *jāti* '. Here the sg. genitive *ajāteḥ* qualifies the pl. genitive *viśeṣaṇānām*, an instance of defective syntactic agreement. For the construction compare P. 3.2.98, where *upapade* is supplied. Thus the rule says...*upapade ajātau* 'when the *upapada* is not a *jāti* '. Here the syntactic agreement is complete. See further *PN*, *pb.* 73, referred to in connection with P. 1.2.48, under 5. Practically, the literal meaning amounts to saying 'of *viśeṣaṇas* which are not *jātivacana* "*jāti*–expressing" words '. That is, of *viśeṣaṇas* which do not refer to *jāti*. See further under 6.

4. The word *ca* is not required for purposes of *anuvṛtti*. Still, it has some function in that it shows connection between P. 1.2.51 and 52.

5. Apart from the present rule, the word *viśeṣaṇa* is used twice in the

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

A. (P. 2.1.57; 2.2.35). The correlative term *viśeṣya* ' word(–meaning) qualified ' is used only once (P. 2.1.57).

Viśeṣaṇa is not the equivalent of what is called adjective in grammar, or of *guṇavacana* ' (word) expressing a quality ' in the *A.* It is rather a logical term referring to a notion which differentiates or qualifies another notion called *viśeṣya.* The qualifying word–meaning may be conveyed by an adjective or by a substantive in apposition. For instance, *āmro vṛkṣaḥ* ' a mango tree '. Here the word *āmraḥ* is the substantive in apposition which conveys the qualifying word–meaning. Or, in short, *āmraḥ* is the qualifying word.

It may be noted here that the *A.* has no term for what we call substantives. It fact, in the *A.* adjectives and substantives are not regarded as different parts of speech on the basis of formal or syntactic features. The term *guṇavacana* ' expressing a quality ' is required for grammatical purposes (e. g., P. 2.1.30) but, apparently, for the description of grammatical facts, a corresponding term for substantives is not required. See Dinabandhu Kar, *Semantic Basis of the Aṣṭādhyāyī.* Unpublished thesis. University of Poona 1980, p. 127. Given the absence of the notion of substantive, it is not surprising that the *A.* does not contain a rule regarding syntactic agreement between *guṇavacana* words and substantives. See Dinabandhu Kar *op. cit.*, p. 130.

6. In the *A.* the word *jāti,* whether as an independent word or as a cp.–constituent, is used in 23 rules. It may be used in the sense of *jātivacana* ' (a word) expressing a *jāti* ' (P. 2.1.65), or in the sense of a group, a class or species (P. 2.1.63; P. 6.3.103). In all these cases reference to particulars, whether one specific individual or any unspecified individuals is excluded. Details can be found in Dinabandhu Kar, *op. cit.*, p. 62–75.

One and the same word, however, may be said to be *jātivacana* ' expressing a *jāti* ' and *ajātivacana* ' expressing what is other than *jāti* '. For instance, the word *go* ' cow ' used by itself without context, is *jātivacana.* It denotes the general concept ' cow '. But in the sentence *gām ānaya* ' bring a cow/bring the cow ' reference is always to a particular cow, whether a specified one or an unspecified one, due to the fact that words within a sentence mutually restrict their meanings. In this case, the word *go* is *ajātivacana.* In fact it is *dravyavacana* ' expressing an individual item or object '. It all depends on use within or without a context.

Also to be kept in mind is that generic properties as *go–tva* ' cow-hood ' lie outside the scope of the concept *jāti* as used in the *A.* The *A.* certainly knows the formation of words like *gotva,* but classifies them as *bhāvavacana*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

'state/condition expressing' words. Compare P. 5.1.119, and Dinabandhu Kar, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

In any case, for P. 1.2.52 to apply, the qualifying word should not refer to things in a general way, but to a particular item.

7. The *KV* quotes two examples for the rule. One of them, based in part on Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 220, lines 6–7), is *pañcālāḥ ramaṇīyāḥ bahvannāḥ bahukṣīraghṛtāḥ bahumālyaphalāḥ* 'the Pañcāla country is beautiful, has plentiful food, has lots of milk and ghee, has many flowers and fruits'. Here the word *pañcālāḥ* is a *taddhita*–derivative in which the *taddhita*–suffix concerned has been *lup*–deleted. See P. 1.2-51, under 7. It refers to a particular country. Therefore the qualifying words *ramaṇīya*, etc., which have the same referent, are *ajātivacana* words. That is why P. 1.2.52 applies.

A counterexample quoted by the *KV* and also based on Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 228, lines 6, 8–9) is *pañcālāḥ janapadaḥ* 'the *janapada* (which is) Pañcālāḥ'. Here the word *pañcālāḥ* is the same *taddhita*– derivative which is used in the previous example. According to tradition, the word *janapada* here is the *viśeṣaṇa*. The expression *pañcālāḥ janapadaḥ* must therefore be considered to be an instance of a noun in apposition. Then, as stated by the *Nyāsa*, the word *janapada* is meant to be a *jātivacana* word. Therefore P. 1.2.52 does not apply. Consequently, we don't see syntactic agreement in number between *pañcālāḥ* and *janapadaḥ*. The example seems rather doubtful.

From these examples we get the idea that what P. 1.2.52 is really concerned with are *viśeṣaṇas* which are *guṇavacana* words, adjectives, and that, by the condition *ajāteḥ*, it wants to exclude substantives in apposition. But how to derive this meaning from the phrasing of the rule itself is not clear.

8. The *KV* mentions a *vārttika*, which is actually *Vt.* V on the present rule. If it is accepted that gender and number are decided by usage, as pointed out by P. 1.2.53, this *Vt.*, like the *Vts* III and IV, and like P. 1.2.51–52, is not required.

9. Since P. 1.2.49 and 51 may be regarded as coming from a non–Pāṇinian source, P. 1.2.52, which is closely connected with P. 1.2.51, may also be regarded as coming from (the same) non–Pāṇinian source.

1.2.53 TAD AŚIṢYAṂ SAṂJÑĀPRAMĀṆATVĀT 'this need not be taught because (for this) we have the authority of words which convey a conventional meaning'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1. This is not a *vidhisūtra*, but taking into account its peculiar way of phrasing (ablative of cause expressed by an abstract noun; see Kiparski 1979 p. 96) also, a *vārtlika*– like statement which rejects an earlier position, a *pūrvapakṣa*. But, as noted by Böhtlingk (note on P. 1.2.53 in his edition of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*), the statements contained in the sequence P. 1.2.53–57 cannot have come from Kātyāyana, because he himself teaches *lup*–deletion. In any case, P. 1.2.53 was known to Patañjali who dispatches it in practically a one line commentary.

2. The question of *anuvṛtti* does not arise.

The *uddeśya* is *tat*. The *vidheya* is *aśiṣyaṃ saṃjñāpramāṇatvāt*.

3. As stated in connection with P. 1.1.61, under 3, the statements contained in P. 1.2.53–57 are a criticism of the *lup*–deletion technique designed to account for conventional meanings. They are important rules, because in essence they deal with the delimitation of the domain of grammar, what should be included and what should not, They can be viewed as a defence of Pāṇini's derivational procedure as against the procedure or procedures adopted in the *taddhita*–section. See further Joshi–Roodbergen 1983, p. 64, 68–69, 75.

4. The word *tat* ' this ' refers to the statement *lupi yuktavad vyaktivacane* in P. 1.2.51, continued in P. 1.2.52. Accordingly the doctrine contained in this statement is not to be taught. We can do without. The doctrine itself can be summed up in three points :

a. The *lup*–deletion technique used to account for conventional, non–derivable word–meanings.

b. The conformity in gender and number between the original noun–base and the *taddhita*–derivative.

c. The agreement in gender and number between non–*jāti* expressing qualifying words and *taddhita*–derived qualified words.

Obviously, when P. 1.2.53 says *tad aśiṣyam*. this should be taken to mean that all of this need not be taught. But here the *KV* on the present rule differs. According to the *KV*, P. 1.2.53 specifically rejects point b. See below, under 5. The rejection of point a., which is the essential point, is reserved for P. 1.2.54. As regards the rejection of point c., no explicit statement is made by the *KV*. In any case, if there is no rule in grammar teaching general syntactic agreement between qualifying words and words qualified, one may wonder why a rule teaching syntactic agreement between non–*jāti* expressing qualified words and *taddhita*–derived qualified words is required.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. What is the ground for rejection ? P. 1.2.53 says, *saṃjñāpramāṇatvāt* 'bacause *saṃjñās* are our final authority'. The idea implied is : not rules of grammar. The *KV*, however, explains the word *saṃjñāpramāṇatvāt* by saying *saṃjñāśabdā hi nānāliṅgasaṃkhyāḥ pramāṇam* 'because words which are *saṃjñās* (and) which have different genders and numbers are our final authority'. Here the addition of the word *nānāliṅgasaṃkhyāḥ* 'which have different genders and numbers' is revealing. As stated above, under 4, the *KV* takes for granted that P. 1.2.55 deals with *lup*–deletion, and P. 1.2.54 only with gender and number, as stated above, under 4 b.

But this explanation by the *KV* is far from satisfactory. The point is that P. 1.2.53 is the main statement which rejects the previous teaching *in toto*, whereas P. 1.2.54–57 enter into details. Moreover, it is difficult to see what the *pramāṇatva* of *saṃjñās* has to do with gender and number. The mere fact of being a *saṃjñā* does not decide gender and number. Therefore the word *saṃjñāpramāṇatvāt* in P. 1.2.53 must be explained differently.

If *saṃjñās* are our final authority as regards the meaning conveyed by them, and not rules of grammar, this can only be taken to mean that this meaning is not to be derived with the help of a stem–suffix analysis. That is to say, the procedure of adding a *taddhita*–suffix in the meaning required and of subsequently deleting it is to be rejected. Once this is rejected, the other points (see under 4) will follow suit.

Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 229, lines 7–8) puts it very briefly, when he says *saṃjānaṃ saṃjñā* which may be rendered as 'the *saṃjñā* (itself) is our means of knowing'. Kaiyaṭa, in his comment on *Bh.* No. 2 on P. 1.2.53, probably anticipating P. 1.2.54, says *na ca pañcālādayo yaugikā api tu janapadādīnāṃ saṃjñās, tato yogānavagamanāt taddhito notpadyate. Iti lup api na vaktavyaḥ* 'and (the meanings of the words) *pañcālāḥ*, etc. are not (further) derivable but they are names af *janapadas*, etc. Therefore, because we don't understand a derivational connection, a *taddhita*(–suffix) is not added. That is why *lup* (–deletion) is not to be prescribed either'.

6. The word *saṃjñā* is used as an independent word in the *A.* 63 times in the sg. locative, once only in the sg. nominative (P. 1.4.1). As a cp. constituent it is used 8 times in the cp. *asaṃjñā*(–*yām*) and 12 times in other cps. It is therefore an important grammatical term. Still, its meaning is not explained, but assumed as known. As stated by the *KV* on P. 1.2.57, *tat pāṇinir ācāryaḥ pratyācaṣṭe lokato 'rthāvagatiḥ* 'this (i. e., explanation of terms like *kāla* 'tense' and *upasarjana* 'subordinate) our teacher Pāṇini rejects because the meaning is understood from usage'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

What is meant by *saṃjñā ?* The most comprehensive explanation is that *saṃjñās* are *rūḍha* words, with a conventional meaning, like names or technical terms. See Dinabandhu Kar, *Semantic Basis of the Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Unpublished thesis. University of Poone 1980, p. 92, 93. 96–97.

7. After having stated that in the case of *saṃjñās* gender and number are established of their own, that is, by usage, and not to be taught by rules of grammar, the *KV* quotes five examples. The first is *āpaḥ* which means 'water' and which is a pl. fem. noun. Why plural and why fem. ? The question is not to be answered by grammar. The second is *dārāḥ*, which means 'wife' and which is a pl. masc. noun. Why plural and why masc. ? The same answer applies.

8. As indicated under 1, the present rule, like the whole sequence P. 1.2.53–57, is of non–Pāṇinian origin. Moreover, it rejects the earlier teaching of P. 1.2.51–52. Then, one may ask, how can the *A.* contain rules which reject the teaching of other rules ? The answer is that *A.* as we have it is a composite work, like many other early Skt *śāstras*. It shows internal inconsistancies which can be used to show the presence of different layers of the text, elaborated and accomodated as far as possible, but still betraying composite authorship,. As the original layer of the text of the *A.* originating from Pāṇini the sections dealing with *saṃjñās* and *paribhāṣās*, with *kārakas* and *vibhaktis*, with *tiṅ*– and *kṛt*– suffixes, and with *aṅga* may be assumed including the division into a *siddha*– and *asiddhakāṇḍa*. Another layer consists of the sections dealing with *samāsa* and *taddhita*. A third layer is that of the *sūtras* P. 1.2.53–57. See further Joshi–Roodbergen 1983, p. 83, fn. 37.

1.2 54 LUB YOGĀPRAKHYĀNĀT '*lup* (–deletion need not be taught) because the connection is no longer clear'.

1 See P. 1.2.53, under 1.

2. The word *aśiṣyam* is continued with *liṅgaviparināma* 'a change of gender' (masc. instead of neuter) from P. 1.2.53.

3. We note again (compare P. 1.2.53, under 1) the use of an ablative of cause, in –*aprakhyānāt*. See Kiparski 1979, p. 96.

4. Patañjali has not commented on the present rule.

5. The *KV* explains that P. 1.2.54 is specifically directel against P. 4.2.81, which prescribes *lup*–deletion in the case of names of *janapadas*, and against P. 4.2.82, which prescribes *lup*–deletion in the case of names of

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

towns. Examples quoted by the *KV* are *pañcālāḥ* and *varaṇāḥ* in the sense of 'a country inhabited by the Pañcālas' and 'a town located not far from *varaṇā* trees'. (P. 4.2.70, *adūrabhava* 'located not far from'). As stated by the *KV*, the point of the present rule is that we no longer understand the connection, namely, between the name and the original noun-base from which the name is supposedly derived. We no longer associate the name with a possible etymology. Therefore the assumption of a *taddhita*-suffix to account for this etymological meaning, and its deletion to account for the actual word-form becomes redundant.

Modern examples would be Punjab and Bihar as names of states. When hearing these names few people would associate them with the etymological meaning of 'possessing five rivers' and '(Buddhist) monastery'.

6. As stated in connection with P. 1.2.53, under 4 and 5, the point made by P. 1.2.54 has already been made by the earlier rule. Therefore, strictly speaking, P. 1.2.54 is not required. But tradition insists that both rules have a separate domain : P. 1.2.53 deals with the conformity in gender and number between the *taddhita*-derivative and the original noun-base, whereas P. 1.2.54 deals with *luṗ*-deletion specifically.

1.2.55 YOGAPRAMĀṆE CA TADABHĀVE 'DARŚANAṂ SYĀT 'and (moreover), if *yoga* "the derivative connection (between an original noun-base and the *taddhita*-derivative)" were decisive (for our understanding of meaning, then) once that (connection) is lost, (the word) would no longer be used'.

1. See P. 1.2.53, under 1. The use of the finite verb *syāt* is another indication of non-Pāṇinian origin.

2. The question of *anuvṛtti* does not arise.

The *uddeśya* is *yogapramāṇe tadabhāve*. The *vidheya* is *adarśanaṃ syāt*.

3. Patañjali has not commented on this rule.

4. The word *ca* indicates a logical connection with the previous rule, in the sense that P. 1.2.55 states an additional ground for rejecting the teaching of P. 1.2.51-52.

5. The *KV* explains that *adarśanam* means *aprayogaḥ* 'non-use'.

6. As stated by the *KV*, we just learned from P. 1.2.53 that the words *pañcālāḥ*, etc. are *saṃjñās* in the sense of words conveying a conventional, non-derivable meaning. The present rule argues that, if derivation were the

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

decisive factor in our understanding of words, then a word would cease to be used once that sense of derivation is lost. But what we see is that words like *pañcālāḥ* and *varaṇāḥ* continue to be used even though people are no longer conscious of the supposedly original meaning. We therefore conclude that what is the decisive factor in understanding and using these words is not derivation as taught by grammar, but usage in which these words have become *rūḍha* 'conveying a conventional meaning', that is, a meaning due to conventions imposed or accepted by the speech-community.

1.2.56 PRADHĀNAPRATYAYĀRTHAVACANAM ARTHASYĀNYAPRAMĀṆATVĀT 'a statement to the effect that the meaning of a suffix is the primary thing (need not be taught) because meaning is decided by something else (than rules of grammar)'.

1. See P. 1.2.53, under 1. The use of the ablative of cause expressed by an abstract noun is indicative of non-Paninian, later origin. See Kiparski 1979, p. 96.

2. The word *aśiṣyam* is continued from P. 1.2.53.

The *uddeśya* is *pradhānapratyayārthavacanam*. The *vidheya* is *aśiṣyam arthasya anyapramāṇatvāt*.

3. The translation given above follows the interpretation of the *SK*, No. 1298 on the present rule. In this interpretation the cp. *pradhānapratyayārthavacanam* is taken to mean *pratyayārthaḥ pradhānam ity evaṃrūpaṃ vacanam* 'statement to the effect that the meaning of a suffix is the principal thing'. Taken thus, the statement is restricted to the principal-subordinate relation between a stem and a suffix in any derived word. In such a word, according to some grammarians, the meaning of the stem is subordinate to that of the suffix, in the sense that it qualifies the meaning of the suffix.

The *KV*, however, interprets differently. It takes *pradhānapratyayārthavacanam* to mean *pradhānaṃ samāse kiṃcit padaṃ pratyayaḥ...tābhyām arthavacanam* 'the expression of meaning by a particular member in a cp., which is the principal (member, or) by a suffix (which is the principal element in a non-cp. word)'. Thus, as compared to the previous interpretation, the *KV* brings in the question of a principal-subordinate relation in a cp. as well. For its interpretation the *KV* invokes two statements by unidentified *pūrvācāryas* 'pre-Pāṇinian teachers'. Here the first statement says *pradhānopasarjane pradhānārthaṃ saha brūtaḥ* 'the principal and the subordinate member (of

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

a cp.) together express the principal meaning'. The second statement says *prakṛtipratyayau sahārtham brūtaḥ* 'the stem and the suffix together express the meaning (of a non-cp. word)'. In this connection the *KV* quotes two examples, one of a genitive *tp.* cp. and the second of a *taddhita*-derivative. See further under 5.

4. The ground for the rejection of this teaching regarding what is the principal element in a word, whether a non-cp. word, or, as assumed by the *KV*, a cp. also, is that meaning is decided by something else. After saying that this teaching of principal and subordinate elements is rejected by Pāṇini, the *KV* explains that "something else" means something different from grammar, namely, *lokaḥ*, the usage of the people, the speech-community. It may be observed that *anya* in *anya-pramāṇatvāt* need not necessarily refer to the usage of the people. It may refer to other sciences than grammar also.

5. To illustrate its interpretation, the *KV* offers two examples. The first is *rājapuruṣam ānaya* 'bring the king-officer'. When hearing this sentence, people will correctly bring a man, an officer as qualified by his relation to the king, not the king himself, nor just any man. The second is *aupagavam ānaya* 'bring Aupagava'. When hearing this sentence, people will correctly bring a descendant as qualified by his relation to the ancestor Upagu, not Upagu himself, nor just any descendant. This goes to show that even people who have no training in grammar will intuitively understand what is the principal element in a cp. and in a *taddhita*-derivative, and act accordingly. No definition of what is principal (or subordinate) by grammar is needed for the correct understanding. Therefore Pāṇini who does not use the distinction principal-subordinate to define relations between grammatical elements like a stem and a suffix (or between noun-stems in a cp.) is vindicated.

6. This is not to say, that the use of this distinction in grammar is objectionable. Technically speaking, the first element in the examples quoted by the *KV*, namely *rājñaḥ* (*puruṣaḥ*) and *upagoḥ* (*apatyam*) appear in the genitive. Therefore this element refers -the point is of reference- to something else than the stem-meaning which is 'king' in the first case and 'Upagu' in the second. Therefore, from the point of view of reference, the meanings 'king' and 'Upagu' are subordinate. Or, in other words, the meanings *puruṣa* and *apatyam* 'descendant' are the principal meanings. Grammatically, this makes good sense.

Or, consider the question of agreement in a sentence like *devadattaḥ pacati* 'Devadatta cooks'. Here the agreement (*sāmānādhikaraṇya*) between

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

a finite verb and the noun functioning as the subject cannot be satisfactorily explained by grammar, unless the meaning of the finite verb ending *-ti* is defined as *ekatva* 'singularity' and *kartā* 'agent'; and unless it is assumed that this (grammatical) meaning is the principal meaning which determines the addition of a nominative ending after the noun-stem *devadatta*.

The point made by P. 1.2.56, however, is that the term *pradhāna* (like the term *upasarjana* in its non-technical sense, for which see P. 1.2.57) need not be defined by grammar, because its meaning is clear from usage. Still another point is that Pāṇini does not use the distinction between *pradhāna* and *upasarjana* for purposes of grammatical explanation.

As stated by Patañjali, *SA*, *Bh*. No. 71: "We do not, in fact, intend to teach meaning. (...) There is really no point at all in explaining meaning which has (already) been understood (from usage)". Grammar uses technical terms in specialised meanings. They are to be defined in a non-technical way. But the words used for definition are not to be defined again. Defining the meanings of these words lies outside the province of grammar.

1.2.57 KĀLOPASARJANE CA TULYAM 'also, *kāla* "(a stretch of) time" and *upasarjana* "subordinate" (need not be taught/defined) equally'.

1. See P. 1.2.53, under 1.

2. The word *aśiṣyam* is continued with *saṃkhyāvipariṇāma* 'a change of number' from P. 1.2.53, as (*kālopasarjane*) *aśiṣye*.

The *uddeśya* is *kālopasarjane*. The *vidheya* is *tulyam aśiṣye*.

3. The word *ca* is not required for purposes of *anuvṛtti*. It merely shows connection with the topic of the preceding rule.

4. The word *kāla* is used 23 times in the *A*., whether as an independent word in the sg. or in the pl., or as a cp.-constituent. It means 'a stretch of time'. It does not mean 'tense'. See Dinabandhu Kar, *Semantic Basis of the Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Unpublished thesis. University of Poona 1980, p. 210. The *KV* on P. 2.4.21 mentions the example *pāṇinyupajñam akālakaṃ vyākaraṇam* 'the grammar composed by Pāṇini in which *kāla* "time" is not defined', as explained by Böhtlingk in his note on P. 2.4.21. As explained by the *Nyāsa* on the *KV* here, however, *akālaka* means 'not containing a section (*adhikāra*) on *kāla*'.

The notion of *kāla* has not been defined by Pāṇini, as correctly noted by Böhtlingk. The present rule makes the point that it need not be defined.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

As will be clear from the illustrations offered by the *KV*, this holds for subdivisions of time like " the present " (*vartamāna*) also.

5. The word *upasarjana*, is used 8 times in the *A*. as an independent word, and once only as a cp. constituent (*anupasarjana*, P. 4.1.14). It is used in two technical meanings, as defined by P. 1.2.43 (*prathamānirdiṣṭa*) and by P. 1.2.44 (*ekavibhakti*), and in one non-technical non-defined meaning, namely, in the sense of *apradhāna* ' other than principal ' that is, subordinate.

The present rule makes it clear that, in order to understand the non-technical meaning, no grammatical definition is required.

6. As explained by the *KV*, the word *tulyam* qualifies *aśiṣya* and refers to the reason stated in P. 1.2.56, namely, that meaning is decided by something else. This is to say, that, in order to understand what is meant by *kāla* and words indicative of *kāla* in the *A*., or what is meant by *upasarjana* in its non-technical sense, we don't need definitions stated by rules of grammar. See P. 1.2.56, under 6.

Really speaking, the word *tulyam* in the present rule is not required. It could have read *kālopasarjane ca*. The words *aśiṣyam* (*aśiṣye*) and *arthasyānyapramāṇatvāt* would have been continued. Therefore, the use of *tulyam* is another indication that P. 1.2.57 is of non-Pāṇinian origin.

7. The *KV* illustrates the point made by means of definitions proposed by grammarians in connection with the word *adyatana* used in the *A*. in the cp. *anadyatana* ' the near-present (not of today) ' four times, and in connection with the word *upasarjana*. The question is, first, what to understand by today ? What do we call a day ? Two definitions are proposed of *ahan* ' day ' which show a divergence of opinion. Then, in the second case, a definition of *upasarjana* as *apradhāna* ' other than principal ' is mentioned.

This type of definitions of meanings which lie outside grammar is rejected by Pāṇini, as the *KV* says. See further P. 1.2.56, under 6.

1.2.58 JĀTYĀKHYĀYĀM EKASMIN BAHUVACANAM ANYATARASYĀM ' given the mention of a *jāti* " class/species " the plural endings (are used) indifferently, even though reference is to one (thing) '.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* which states an option to the use of the singular as prescribed by P. 1.4.22. The option is restricted to the case of *jātiśabdas* ' words expressing a *jāti* '. In such a case, the use of the plural endings is also allowed.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

According to tradition as represented by the *KV*, the present rule is an *atideśasūtra* 'rule of transference' which extends the use of the plural also to *jātiśabdas*. See further below, under 5.

2. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya* any previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are cancelled. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

In fact, we note that the present rule has no connection at all with the previous rules. It opens a new sequence of rules, P. 1.2.58–63, which deals with alternative uses of number.

The *uddeśya* is *jātyākhyāyām ekasmin*. The *vidheya* is *bahuvacanam anyatarasyām*.

3. As explained by the *KV*, the word *jātyākhyāyām* is a *tp*. cp. The word *ākhyā* is explained by the *Nyāsa* here as *ākhyānam*, that is, *pratyāyanam* 'making known, mentioning'. The locative is a *saṭsaptamī*, for which see under P. 1.2.49, under 3.

For the meaning of *jāti* see P. 1.2.52, under 6. Here it is explained that, when the question is of *jāti* in the *A*. reference is never to one particular item or individual, but to all individuals belonging to a class/species.

4. The word *ekasmin*, interpreted as *ekasminn api*, represents a meaning condition. In the *A*. meaning–conditions are stated in the locative.

5. The word *bahuvacanam* is technically defined by P. 1.4.21 as a plural ending suffix, in the sense of 'many (items)'. This clearly prohibits the addition of these endings after words which convey the sense of one, like *jātiśabdas* 'words denoting a *jāti*', because a *jāti* is inherently one. This is the idea presupposed by P. 1.2.58. As the *KV* puts it, *jātir nāmāyam eko 'rthaḥ. Tadabhidhāne ekavacanam eva prāptam* 'this which is called *jāti* is one (single) thing. When reference is to this, the singular only becomes applicable'. But then, how to justify usages like *saṃpannāḥ yavāḥ* 'the barley has ripened', where *yava* 'barley' is a *jāti*–word and is still used in the plural ?

As explained by the *Nyāsa* here, in the case of a plurality of items, the only rule which can apply for number is P. 1.4 21. If plurality of items is lacking, and if still the application of this rule is required to justify usage, then we must assume that item concerned is treated as many (*Vt*. VI on P. 1.2.58, *bahuvat*; Patañjali, *Mbh*. I, p. 230, line 13, *bahuvadbhāva*). As further explained by the *Nyāsa* here, this assumption of *bahuvadbhāva* requires a literal interpretation of the term *bahuvacanam* in the sense of *bahūnām uktiḥ* 'speaking of many'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

6. *Anyatarasyām* means 'indifferenty'. That is to say, no preference for the one option or the other is indicated. See Kiparski 1979, p. 1.

7. Two examples offered by the *KV* are *saṃpanno yavaḥ|saṃpannā yavāḥ* 'the barley has ripened' and *pūrvavayā brāhmaṇaḥ pratyuttheyaḥ| pūrvavayaso brāhmaṇāḥ pratyuttheyāḥ* 'brahmins of a more advanced age should be respectfully greeted by rising from one's seat'. The point made by these examples is, of course, that both the singular words (*yavaḥ*, *brāhmaṇaḥ*) and the plural words (*yavāḥ*, *brāhmaṇāḥ*) are *jātiśabdas*. Like in English, an assertion about a class or species can be made by using the singular or the plural : a cat has nine lives; dogs are watchful. See O. Jespersen, *Essentials of English Grammar* 1933, p. 212–13.

8. Kātyāyana, *Vts* VI and VII on the present rule, says that P. 1.2.58 is not required. His reason is that by means of a *jātiśabda* we refer to individuals, be it in a general, non-particular way. Therefore the use of the plural need not be specially prescribed. This point of view comes near to that of a *vyaktivādin* 'advocate of the view that words refer to individual objects/ items only'. See *PASPA*, fn. 294.

Patañjali agrees in rejecting the rule. His conclusion is that when reference is to individuals, that is, to individuals subsumed under the *jāti*, the plural is used, and that when reference is made in general (*sāmānyābhidhānam*, that is, *sāmānyena abhidhānam*) the singular is used (*Mbh.* I, p. 230 lines 20–21).

1.2.59 (a) ASMADAḤ '(even when reference is to one individual, the plural endings may be used indifferently) for (the pronominal stem) *asmad*'.

1. The rule translated here is not P. 1.2.59 in its traditional wording. We propose to divide this rule into two rules, as follows :

P. 1.2.59 (a) *asmadaḥ*

P. 1.2.59 (b) *dvayoś ca*.

The reason for this division of the text is the function assigned to the particle *ca* here, namely, that of boundary marker. Unless it is declared redundant, it cannot have any other function. A redundant *ca*, however, is never added after the second word in a rule. See further Joshi– Bhate 1983, p. 35.

2. According to the *Nyāsa* on the *KV* here, the undivided rule P. 1.2.59 is another *atideśasūtra* 'rule of transferencs'. See P. 1.2.58, under 5. If however the traditional argument is not accepted, P. 1.2.59 must be regarded as a *vidhisūtra* stating an option to P. 1.4.22, in the sense that the use of plural

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

endings is also allowed in the case of *asmad*, when actual reference is to one individual only, namely, the speaker. Similarly, the divided (a) and (b) rules will be regarded as *vidhisūtras*.

3. The words *ekasmin bahuvacanam anyatarasyām* are continued from the preceding rule. For the continuation of *anyatarasyām* see Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 272, convention 24.

The *uddeśya* is *ekasmin asmadaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *bahuvacanam anyatarasyām*.

4. Since clearly the word *phalgunīproṣṭha-padānām* in P. 1.2.60, which belongs to the same sequence of rules as P. 1.2.59, is a genitive, it is assumed that *asmadaḥ* is a genitive too.

5. The example offered by the *KV* and borrowed from Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 230, line 23) is *ahaṃ bravīmi/vayaṃ brūmaḥ* ' I/we speak '.

6. According to Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 230, line 23), the undivided rule P. 1.2.59–and thus the (a) and the (b) rule as well–can be dispensed with. The choice between the singular *ahaṃ* and the plural *vayam* is really one of *vivakṣā* ' the speaker's intention ', and thus lies outside the rule of grammar.

7. The *KV* on P. 1.2.59 mentions two additional rules. One is the slightly changed wording of a non–Kātyāyana *vārttika* on P. 1.2.58 (*Mbh.* I, p. 230, line 10). It says *saviśeṣaṇasya pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ* ' a prohibition is to be stated (for the optional use of the plural for *asmad*) when (*asmad*) is accompanied by a qualifying word '. One of the examples quoted by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 230, line 11) is *ahaṃ paṇḍito bravīmi* ' I, the paṇḍita, say '.

The second statement has not been traced. It deals with a plural of respect in connection with *yuṣmad*. When addressing a *guru*, one may either use the singular (*tvam*) or the plural (*yūyam*). According to the *KV*, the optional use of the plural extends to the word *guru* itself also.

1.2.59 (b) DVAYOŚ CA ' also, even when reference is to two individuals (the plural endings may be used indifferently for the pronominal stem *asmad*) '.

1. For the division of P. 1.2.59 see P. 1.2.59 (a), under 1.

2. This is a *vidhisūtra*, which lays down an option to the dual endings prescribed by P. 1.4.22. See P. 1.2.59 (a), under 2.

3. The words *asmadaḥ bahuvacanam anyatarasyām* are continued from P. 1.2.59 (a). The word *ekasmin* is cancelled by the mention of *dvayoḥ*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The *uddeśya* is *asmadaḥ dvayoḥ*. The *vidheya* is *bahuvacanam anyatarasyām*.

4. For the function of the particle *ca* see P. 1.2.59 (a), under 1.

5. The word *dvayoḥ* represents a meaning–condition. See P. 1.2.58, under 4.

6. The example offered by the *KV* and borrowed from Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 230, line 23) is *āvāṃ brūvaḥ/vayaṃ brūmaḥ* 'the two of us/we speak'.

7. According to Patañjali, this (b) rule is not required. See P. 1.2.59 (a), under 6.

1.2.60 PHALGUNĪPROṢṬHAPADĀNĀṂ CA NAKṢATRE 'also, when reference is to an asterism (the plural endings may be used indifferently even when reference is to two items) for (the names) *phalgunī* and *proṣṭhapadā*'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* (*atideśasūtra*, according to tradition; see P. 1.2.58, under 1), which optionally allows the use of the plural instead of the dual prescribed by P. 1.4.22, in the case of names of two twin stars.

2. The words *dvayoḥ bahuvacanam anyatarasyām* are continued from P. 1.2.59 (b), and from P. 1.2.58. Any other previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are discontinued by the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya*.

The *uddeśya* is *phalgunīproṣṭhapadānāṃ nakṣatre dvayoḥ*. The *vidheya* is *bahuvacanam anyatarasyām*.

3. The names *phalgunī* and *proṣṭhapadā* each refer to a cluster of stars distinguished as *pūrva* and *uttara*, which appear in conjunction with the moon at a particular time of the year.

4. The particle *ca* is not required for purposes of *anuvṛtti*. Nor does it function as a boundary marker. It merely indicates connection with the topic of the preceding rule.

5. The locative word *nakṣatre* represents a meaning–condition. See P. 1.2.58, under 4. As explained by the *KV*, the rule does not apply, when *phalgunī* (and *proṣṭhapadā*) is the name of two girls who happen to be born under the asterism Phalgunī.

6. One of the examples offered by the *KV* and based on Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 231, lines 4–5) is *kadā pūrve phalgunyau/kadā pūrvāḥ phalgunyaḥ* 'when (has) the *pūrvā phalgunī* risen ?'. The dual and plural forms of the adjective *pūrva* merely follow those of *phalgunī*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

7. According to Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 231, line 4), the rule can be dispensed with. His reason is that the form *phalgunī* in the sense of an asterism is only used, when the moon is in conjunction. So, in fact, there are three objects. Consequently, the use of the plural is appropriate. On the other hand, when reference is to the twin stars exclusively, the dual is appropriate.

Patanjali's explanation is an *ad hoc* explanation. Probably, in the case of the asterism, duality is not clearly understood.

1.2.61 CHANDASI PUNARVASVOR EKAVACANAM 'in the Veda (although reference is to two) the singular endings (are optionally used) for (the name) *punarvasū* (when reference is to an asterism)'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* (*atideśasūtra*, according to tradition; see P. 1.2.58, under 1), which optionally allows the use of the singular instead of of the dual prescribed by P. 1.4.22, in the case of the twin star name Punarvasū.

2. The words *dvayoḥ nakṣatre anyatarasyām* are continued from P. 1.2.59 (b), 1.2.60 and 1.2.58 respectively. The mentiou of *ekavacanam* cancels that of *bahuvacanam*. Although the *vidheya* of P. 1.2.61 differs from that of P. 1.2.58–60, the word *anyatarasyām* is still continued in P. 1.2.61–62, because of the mention of *nityam* in P. 1.2.63. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 273 convention 33.

The *uddeśya* is *chandasi dvayoḥ nakṣatre punarvasvoḥ*. The *vidheya* is *ekavacanam anyatarasyām*.

3. As explained by the *KV*, the rule does not apply when *punarvasū* is the name of two boys who happen to be born under the asterism *Punarvasū*. Compare P. 1.2.60, under 5.

4. The examples offered by the *KV* are *punarvasur nakṣatram aditir devatā* 'the asterism Punarvasu is the goddess Aditi (*Maitrāyaṇīsaṃhitā* 2.13.2) for the singular, and *punarvasū nakṣatram aditir devatā* (*Tattirīya-saṃhitā* 4.4.10) for the dual.

5. Kātyāyana and Patañjali think that the present rule can be dispensed with. See P. 1.2.62, under 5.

1.2.62 VIŚAKHAYOŚ CA 'and also (in the Veda, although reference is to two) the singular endings (are optionally used) for (the name) *viśakhe* (when reference is to an asterism)'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1. The rule as it is, is a *vidhisūtra* (*atideśasūtra*, according to tradition; see P. 1.2.58, under 1), which optionally allows the use of the singular instead of the dual prescribed by P. 1.4.22, in the case of the twin star name Viśakhe. See further below, under 3.

2. The words *chandasi dvayoḥ ekavacanam anyatarasyām* are continued from P. 1.2.61, 1.2.59 (b), 1.2.61 and 1.2.58 respectively. For the continuation of *anyatarasyām* see P. 1.2.61, under 2.

3. The word *ca* is not required for purposes of *anuvṛtti*. Nor is it required as a boundary marker, because P. 1.2.61 and 62 in their present form must be two rules anyway. The function of *ca* may, however, be to ensure the continuation of *chandasi* in the present rule. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 274, convention 47.

Actually, P. 1.2.61–62 could have been phrased as single rule, *punarvasūviśakhānām*. Since this is not the case, P. 1.2.62 may be regarded as a latter addition.

4. The examples offered by the *KV* are *viśakhā nakṣatram indrāgnī devatā* 'the asterism *viśakhā* is / are the deity / the two deities Indra and Agni' (*Maitrāyaṇīsaṃhitā* 2.13.20) for the singular, and *viśakhe nakṣatram indrāgnī* (*Taittirīyasaṃhitā* 4.4.10.2) for the dual.

5. Kātyāyana (*Vt.* I on P. 1.2.61–62) and Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 231, lines 8–12) deal with P. 1.2.61–62 together. According to both, the two rules are not required. As stated by Kātyāyana in his *vārttika*, to have the singular instead of the dual in the Veda, we can manage by P. 7.1.39. This rule says that in the Veda the sg. ending *sU* may replace any *suP* ending. Patañjali (*Mbh.* III, p. 256, line 13) mentions a *bhāṣyavārttika* which says *supāṃ ca supo bhavantīti vaktavyam* 'the statement should be made that also (in the Veda) any case ending may replace any case ending'. Thereby it is clear that Vedic forms cannot be technically explained in the *A.*, and that, if they are treated in the *A.* they are dealt with in a patch-up way which contrasts strongly with the way in which the data from the *bhāṣā* are treated in the *A.* See Kiparski 1979, p. 56.

1.2.63 TIṢYAPUNARVASVOR NAKṢATRADVANDVE BAHUVACANASYA DVIVACANAṂ NITYAM 'given a *dvandva* cp. of (names of) asterisms for *tiṣya* and *punarvasū*, (then) in the place of the plural endings the dual endings (are) invariably (used)'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* (*atideśasūtra*, according to tradition; see P. 1.2.58, under 1), which prescribes the invariable use of the dual in the place of the plural required by an *itaretaradvandva* referring to three or more items. See *BDA* p. 141.

2. As stated by the *KV*, the word *chandasi* from P. 1.2.61 is discontinued. See on this point Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 274, convention 46. The mention of *dvivacanam* and *nityam* cancels that of *ekavacanam* from P. 1.2.61 and of *anyatarasyām* from P. 1.2.58. Any other previous *uddesya* and *vidheya* items are cancelled by the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya*.

The *uddeśya* is *tiṣyapunarvasvoḥ nakṣatradvandve bahuvacanasya*. The *vidheya* is *dvivacanaṃ nityam*.

3. As explained by the *KV*, since *tiṣya* refers to one star and *punarvasū* to two stars, we expect the plural to be used in the *dvandva* cp. formed of names of these stars, by P. 1.4.21.

But then, why does the rule explicitly mention *bahuvacanasya*? The question and the discussion on this point come from Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 232, lines 2, ff.). Patañjali's conclusion is that the word *bahuvacanasya*, which is redundant, really speaking, has been mentioned to give us a clue (*jñāpaka*). The clue is that every *dvandva* may be optionally treated as singular: *sarvo dvandvo vibhāṣaikavad bhavati* (*Mbh.* I, p. 232, lines 4–5). Then, to reject the application of this option of the singular number in the case of a *dvandva* formed of the names *tiṣya* and *punarvasū*, the word *bahuvacanasya* has been stated in P. 1.2.63, and thus becomes purposeful.

The word *bahuvacanasya* is a technical genitive in the sense of *sthāne* 'in the place', by P. 1.1.49. Therefore, in the *prakriyā*, the plural endings should be added first after the cp. stem, and then be subsequently replaced by dual endings. However, this is never done. The more proper way of phrasing the rule would be *bahuṣu dvivacanaṃ nityam* 'although reference is to many, the dual endings are invariably used'.

4. Following Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 231, lines 14–15), the *KV* explains that the rule does not apply, when *tiṣya* and *punarvasū* are names of boys born under these asterisms.

5. The example offered by the *KV* is *uditau tiṣyapunarvasū dṛśyete* 'Tiṣya and Punarvasū are seen to have risen'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.2.64 SARŪPĀṆĀM EKAŚEṢA EKAVIBHAKTAU 'provided that one (and the same) ending follows, (then) out of (lexical items) which have the same form one (only) remains'.

1. The rule may be taken as a *vidhisūtra*, in the sense that it prescribes *ekaśesa*. Nāgeśa, however, in his comment on *Bh.* No. 20 on the present rule says that P. 1.2.64 is not prescriptive in character, but is rather a *niyama* 'restrictive rule'. The reason is that it restricts the operation of P. 2.2.29 which prescribes *dvandva* cp. formation to words showing a different form. Thus P. 1.2.64 prevents *dvandva* cp. formation of words which have the same form. The *Śabdakaustubha*, Vol. II, *The Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series*, Benares 1929, p. 38, line 26, says that the *ekaśeṣa*–rule is an exception (*apavāda*) to P. 2.2.29.

2. The present rule opens up a new sequence of rules, namely, P. 1.2.64-73. All of these rules deal with forms conveying more than one lexical meaning, mostly elliptic duals.

3. P. 1.2.64 shows no formal connection with the previons rules. By the introduction of a new incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya* any previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are cancelled. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271. convention 4.

The *uddeśya* is best taken as *sarūpāṇām ekavibhaktau*. Accordingly, the *vidheya* is *ekaśeṣaḥ*.

4. According to the Kielhorn edition of the *Mahābhāṣya*, Kātyāyana has phrased 59 *vārttikas* on the present rule, which must be a record number for a single rule. By way of comparison : on P. 2.1.1, a rule which forms an *āhnika* by itself, Kātyāyana phrased 33 *vārttikas*.

5. As stated by *Vts* I–III, the presupposition of the *ekaśeṣa*–technique is that words refer each time to a single object. This being so, in order to refer to more than one object, more than one word is needed. For instance, to refer to two trees, we have to use the word *vṛkśa* 'tree' twice, and to refer to more than two trees, that is, many trees, we have to use the word *vṛkṣa* three times. Rather, as if grammatical number is the outcome of an addition sum in arithmetics.

But, as Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 233, lines 21–22) says, it is desired also that one word refers to more than one object; We have the usages *vṛkṣau* 'two trees' and *vṛkṣāḥ* (many) trees' which are single words. Then, if words can refer each time to a single object only, how to account for such

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

usages ? That is why P. 1.2.64 has been phrased. It says that we can account for the use of single words expressing the idea of two or more items by assuming *ekaśeṣa*.

6. As explained by the *KV*, the word *sarūpāṇām* is a *bv.* cp. (by P. 2.2.24) in the sence of *samānaṃ rūpam eṣām* 'they have the same form'. The word *samānam* is replaced by *sa*, by P. 6.3.85.

According to Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 233, lines 7–8), the fact that the rule says *ekaśeṣaḥ*, and not just *ekaḥ*, makes it clear that the genitive *sarūpāṇām* is not a technical genitive in the sense of *sthāne* 'in the place', by P. 1.1.49. The question is not of *ādeśa* 'substitution', but of one item remaining out of two or three. In fact, the genitive is a *nirdhāraṇaṣaṣṭhī* 'a genitive ending indicating specification', namely, one out of many, by P. 2.3.41.

We note that P. 1.2.64 does not say whether the words or stems which show an identical form should convey an identical meaning also. The rule says *sarūpāṇām*, but does not say *samānārthāṇām* 'of (lexical items) having the same meaning'. This being so, P. 1.2.64 can be applied in two situations :

(1) The words concerned have the same form and the same meaning. This is the case of wordgroups like *vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca* or *vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca*, which are assumed to be the *laukika* expressions for the dual and plural meanings *vṛkṣau* and *vṛkṣāḥ*.

(2) The words concerned have the same form, but a different meaning. This is the case of homonyms. An example is the wordgroup *akṣaś ca akṣaś ca akṣaś ca*, which is assumed to be the *laukika* expression for the plural meaning *akṣāḥ*. In this expression the word *akṣāḥ* each time refers to a different thing, namely, a die, an axle and a particular fruit. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 239, line 3) quotes two more examples, namely, *pādāḥ* and *māṣāḥ*. We note that the *laukika* expression lists dictionary meanings. Whether the plural form *akṣāḥ* in a given context, apart from the literary device known as *śleṣa*, really conveys these three different meanings is questionable.

The two situations have been mentioned in *Vts* XXI and XXII. Then Vt. XXIII adds another situation which we will note as

(3) The words concerned have a different form but the same meaning. A simple example would be *ghaṭaś ca kumbhaś ca* 'a pot and a pitcher'. Here usage would either have *ghaṭau* or *kumbhau*. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 239, lines 7–8) quotes a different example.

By *Vt.* XXIII *dvandva* cp. formation of synonyms is prohibited.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

We note that *Vt.* XXII, which deals with possibility (2), provides the grammatical justification for what is known as *śleṣa* in Sanskrit literature.

Is the *ekaśeṣa*–technique really required in these cases? Here a distinction should be made. On the one hand, *ekaśeṣa* is supposed to account for dual and plural number. On the other hand, it is supposed to account for homonyms and for elliptic duals (and a few plurals), for which see P. 1.2.65–73. As regards number, *ekaśeṣa* is based on a misconception. Number is not conveyed by a repetition of lexical items, but by suffixes which have other functions as well. Pāṇini's prescription to this effect is unambiguous (P. 1.4.21–22). As regards homonyms and elliptic duals, *ekaśeṣa* as a grammatical device is not required, because in the case of homonyms we have different words which merely coincide in form, whereas in the case of elliptic duals we have particular meaning–usages which, as such, lie outside the domain of grammar. Compare *SA*, *Bh.* No. 71, " We do not, in fact, intend to teach meaning. (...) There is really no point in explaining meaning which has (already) been understood (from usage) ". Therefore the answer to the question put above is no.

In Pāṇini's system every rule, directly or indirectly (*saṃjñās*, *paribhāṣās*), deals with derivation. The attempts undertaken by tradition to accommodate the *ekaśeṣa*– technique of derivation within the framework of Pāṇini's derivational system run into all kinds of difficulties. One of them has been noted by *Vt.* XXV on the present rule. By this *Vt.* words signifying number are excluded from *ekaśeṣa*. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 239, line 12) quotes two examples. The first is the expression *ekaś ca ekaś ca*. Since reference is to two items, we would derive the form *ekau*, which is not used. The second example is *dvau ca dvau ca*. Since reference is to four items, we would derive the plural form *dve*. But this form is not used either.

7. The word *ekaśeṣa* is explained by the *KV* as *ekaḥ śiṣyate* ' one (item) is left out '. As stated by Kaiyaṭa on *Bh.* No. 3 on the present rule, the word *śeṣa* can be taken as *bhāvasādhana* ' allowing a derivation in the sense of impersonal action ', or as *karmasādhana* ' allowing a derivation in the sense of (grammatical) object '. In the first case *śeṣa* means *śeṣaṇa* ' (the act of) retaining '. In the second case it means *śiṣyate* ' it is left out ' (or *śiṣṭa* (the object) left out '). According to the *KV*, the latter interpretation is to be adopted. Thus *ekaśeṣa* means ' a single item which is left out / retained '.

8. *Ekavibhaktau* stands for a condition stated in the locative. Here the locative is a technical one, as prescribed by P. 1.1.66. Thus *ekavibhaktau* is interpreted as *ekavibhaktau parataḥ* ' when one (and the same) *vibhakti*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

follows '. According to P. 1.4.104, the term *vibhakti* may refer to a case ending or to a finite verb ending.

Now how to connect the condition *ekavibhaktau ?* There are two main possibilities : either we connect it with *ekaśeṣaḥ* (possibility A), or we connect it with *sarūpāṇām* (possibility B). Possibility A is discussed in *Vts* IV–XX. In this case, the *ekaśeṣa*–operation becomes conditioned by a following *vibhakti*, and thus becomes part of the regular *prakriyā*. Now there are two possibilities again : either the *vibhakti* is added to a sequence of stems, whether taken as a compound or as a non–compound, as a whole (possibility A 1), or the *vibhakti* is added to each constituent separately (possibility A 2). Possibility A 1 is mentioned by *Vt.* IV. Possibility A 2 is mentioned by *Vt.* V.

In possibility A 1 we start the *prakriyā* from technical expressions of non–cp. wordgroups like *vṛkṣa* + *vṛkṣa* + *au* for the dual, and *vṛkṣa* + *vṛkṣa*+ *vṛkṣa* + *Jas* for the plural. Here the difficulty is, how to add a *vibhakti* to the group as a whole ? The constituents themselves may be *prātipadikas*, but the group as a whole is not. Therefore P. 4.1.1 cannot become applicable. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 234, lines 9–10) suggests a way out by referring to P. 1.2.45. Since a wordgroup is *arthavat* 'meaningful', etc., it could be called *prātipadika*. But this idea has already been rejected by *Vt.* VI. on P. 1.2.45. See P. 1.2.45, under 8. How can a group of nominal stems become a nominal stem ?

Then let us add the *vibhakti* to each constituent singly. That gives us technical expressions like *vṛkṣa* + *sU* + *vṛkṣa* + *sU* for the dual, and *vṛkṣa* + *sU* + *vṛkṣa* + *sU* + *vṛkṣa* + *sU* for the plural. Here the question is not of *prātipadikas* 'nominal stems', but of a sequence of *fully* finished *padas*. This is the idea mentioned by *Vt.* V. The difficulty here is that the *ekaśeṣa*–operation has no provision for dropping the case ending after the one constituent remaining.

So much for possibility A. Suffice it to say that the treatment of the expressions *vṛkṣa* + *vṛkṣa* + *au*, etc. as compounds is mentioned and rejected by *Vt.* VI. What happens in possibility B, when we connect *ekavibhaktau* with *sarūpāṇām ?*

The first consequence is that the *ekaśeṣa*–operation becomes *anaimittika* 'without cause/condition', as far as derivation is concerned. We can apply *ekaśeṣa* without taking into account any *vibhakti*. That is to say, we can apply *ekaśeṣa* even before a *vibhakti* has been added, before the regular *prakriyā* starts. Or, in other words, the connection between *ekaśeṣa* and

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

prakriyā has been severed. The second consequence is that the *ekaśeṣa*–operation becomes restricted to those lexical items which show an identical form before the *ekavibhakti*. The point is that when a technical locative and a genitive form are used, the item referred to by the locative form must be the following item. Consequently, the item referred to by the genitive form must be the preceding item. The preceding item with reference to a *vibhakti* can only be a word–stem.

What is the advantage of this way of connecting *ekavibhaktau* over the one mentioned earlier ? The advantage is that the *ekaśeṣa*–operation has become *anaimittika*, and therefore can take place before *vibhaktis* have been added. This is to say, that we can apply *ekaśeṣa* to groups of word–stems like *vṛkṣa* + *vṛkṣa*, or *vṛkṣa* + *vṛkṣa* + *vṛkṣa*, and retain one item *vṛkṣa* only. In this way the difficulty of removing the case endings mentioned earlier has been avoided.

There is, however, one snag. It has been noticed by *Vt.* XVII. This *Vt.* states a prohibition of *ekaśeṣa* in the case of the stems *mātṛ* and *mātṛ*. We have two stems *mātṛ*, one meaning 'mother', the other meaning 'one who measures'. Since the *prātipadikas* show the same form, we would apply *ekaśeṣa* resulting in the form *mātr*, wherever reference is to a mother and a measurer. But a difficulty arises in the nom./acc. dual and in the nom. plural. Here the wordstems do not show the same form. We have *mātar* + *au*/*mātar* +*Jas* on the one hand, and *mātār*+*au*/*mātār*+*Jas* on the other. Therefore, by just using one stem–form here, we would be misunderstood. That is why *Vt.* XVII phrases its prohibition. Thereby, for all practical purposes, *ekavibhaktau sarūpāṇām* comes to mean that the wordstems concerned must show the same form before all *vibhaktis*.

As stated above, the difficulty of removing the case endings in expressions like *vṛkṣa* + *sU* + *vṛkṣa* + *sU*, etc. has been avoided, when we connect *ekavibhaktau* with *sarūpāṇām*. The difficulty which has not been solved is how to add the desired ending after the single remaining wordstem *vṛkṣa*.

Regarding possibility B, in which we connect *ekavibhaktau* with *sarūpāṇām*, there is still another view. It originates from Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 237, lines 25–27). According to Patañjali, the term *vibhakti* in *ekavibhaktau* need not be taken in its technical, grammatical sense, but can be taken in its literal meaning of *vibhāga* 'division'. Reference is to the divisions, groups of endings as mentioned by P. 4.1.2 (case endings) and by P. 3.4.78 (finite verb endings). Thus *ekavibhaktau sarūpāṇām* is taken to mean that *ekaśeṣa* takes place of word–stems which show an identical form within one

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

and the same division. Accordingly, *ekaśeṣa* can be established of *sarūpa* forms which end in a *vibhakti*. To put it in a Sanskrit phrase, *ekavibhāge yāni sarūpāṇi dṛṣṭāni teṣāṃ vibhaktyantānāṃ padānām evaikaśeṣaḥ* '*ekaśeṣa* (takes place) of those fully finished forms only which appear as having the same form within one and the same division '. Apart from the far-fetched meaning assigned to the word *vibhakti*, the difficulty here is, how to get rid of the ending of the one *pada* remaining. There are some other difficulties also, already noted by *Vts* X–XII. See *Mbh*. I, p. 237, line 27–p. 238, line 1.

Immediately hereafter Patañjali, to avoid the difficulties noted, puts forward another idea to save *ekaśeṣa*. He says *sahavivakṣāyām ekaśeṣaḥ* ' when (the speaker) wishes to convey things together, *ekaśeṣa*. (is applied) '. Thereby *ekaśeaṣa* is completely withdrawn from the control of grammar. The view proposed is rejected on the ground that in this case expressions like *vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣāś ca* would never be used. Instead, people would say *vṛkṣau ca vṛkṣau ca*, or *vṛkṣāś ca vṛkṣāś ca vṛkṣāś ca*. In the latter expressions the wordform itself indicates *sahavivakṣā* (*Mbh*. I, p. 238, lines 2–3).

9. *Vts* XXVII– XXXIV deal with the question whether our understanding of the sense of ' two ' and ' many ' comes naturally from the use of words like *vṛkṣau* and *vṛkṣāḥ*, or whether we understand these meanings on the basis of the *ekaśeṣa*–rule. *Vt*. XXIX, which takes the first view, says *aśiṣya ekaśeṣa ekenoktatvāt* '*ekaśeṣa* need not be taught, because (the meanings concerned, namely, of ' two ' and ' many ') have (already) been expressed by (the use of) one single (word) '. In this connection Patañjali mentions the grammatical dictum *uktārthānām aprayogaḥ* ' (words) are not used to denote things which have (already) been expressed ' (*Mbh*. I, p. 240, line 25). In the explanatory wordgroups like *vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca*, etc. things are denoted twice or thrice over.

Against the argument of *Vt*. XXIX it is maintained (by *Vt*. XXXII) *ekenoktatvād aparasya prayogo 'nupapanna iti ced anuktatvāt plakṣeṇa nyagrodhasya nyagrodhaprayogaḥ* ' if (it is said) that the use of another (word) is improper because (the meaning concerned) has (already) been expressed by (the use of) one single (word, we answer that the word) *nyagrodha* is used because the meaning of (the word) *nyagrodha* has not (already) been expressed by (the word) *plakṣa* '. Reference is to the *dvandva* cp. *plakṣanyagrodhau* ' a *plakṣa* tree and a *nyagrodha* tree '. The point is that in a *dvandva* cp., like in *ekaśeṣa*, we find simultaneous reference, as indicated by the word

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

ca in the explanatory wordgroup *plakṣaś ca nyagrodhaś ca*. Still, to refer to these two items simultaneously, we use two lexical items, as is clear from the *dvandva* cp. The same should hold good in the case of *ekaśeṣa*. To refer to two or many objects we should use the word concerned twice of three times. This is, of course, the basic supposition of the *ekaśeaṣa*-doctrine. The argument itself rests on the continuing confusion of lexical and grammatical meaning.

10. In his comment on *Bh*. No. 85 (on *Vt*. XX) Kaiyaṭa sums up six views on *ekaśeṣa* presented so far. In his comment on *Bh*. No. 112 (on *Vt*. XXVII) he says, (...) *nivṛtteṣu śabdāntareṣu śiṣyamāṇena śabdena svasminn evaikatrārthe avastheyam.... Sarveṣu pakṣeṣv ayaṃ doṣaḥ. Prātipadikaikaśeṣe dvivacanabahuvacanānutpattiprasaṅgaḥ. Vibhaktyantānāṃ vibhaktau vā parata ekaśeṣe 'rthābhāvād dvivacanabahuvacanayor nivṛttiprasaṅgaḥ. Atha svabhāvataḥ śiṣyamāṇo 'nekārthaḥ kim ekaśeṣeṇa* ' once the other words have disappeared, the word which remains can only continue to denote its own single meaning. This is the shortcoming in all views. If *ekaśeṣa* (is applied) to *prātipadikas*, (we face) the undesired possibility that the dual and plural endings cannot be added. If *ekaśeṣa* (is applied) to (items) ending in a *vibhakti* or before a *vibhakti*, (then we face) the undesired possibility of the disappearance of the dual and plural endings, because the sense (of two or more) is not (denoted). If the word which remains by itself conveys the sense of ' more than one ', what is the use of *ekaśeṣa* ? '

In fact, by the assumption that grammatical number is conveyed by a repetition of lexical items the discussion has been misconstrued from the beginning.

11. Starting from *Vt*. XXXV the topic of the discussion shifts. Kaiyaṭa, in his comment on *Bh*. No. 135 (on *Vt*. XXXV), has the following to say : *idānīm ākṛtipakṣāśrayeṇa pratyākhyānaṃ karoti* (..). *Jātiḥ śabdārthaḥ. Tasyāḥ ekatvād anekaśabdaprayogaprasaṅga eva nāsti. Kim ekaśeṣeṇa...* ' now (the *Vārttikakāra*) rejects (the *ekaśeṣa*-procedure) by having recourse to the *ākṛti*-view. *Jāti* " class, species " is the meaning of a word. Because this (*jāti*) is one, the undesired possibility of using more than one word does not arise. What is the use of *ekaśeṣa* ? '

It has been shown that the *ekaśeṣa*-prodedure as a word-derivational procedure within Pāṇini's system runs into all kinds of difficulties. Therefore it is to be rejected. Thereby P. 1.2.64 is rejected also. But the (philosophical) question whether a nominal stem by itself can refer to more than one item remains. It is to answer this question that Kātyāyana brings in the issue of

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

the *ākṛtivāda* (later identified with the *jātivāda*, see *PASPA*. Note (22)) and the *dravyavāda*. According to the *ākṛtivāda*, nouns mean, signify an *ākṛti*. By *ākṛti* the common shape shared by members of a given class or species is meant. For instance, the word *gauḥ* means an animal possessing a dewlap, tail, hump, hoofs and horns (*PASPA*, Bh. No. 5). Accordingly, by means of the word *gauḥ* we can refer to all animals belonging to this species. According to the *dravyavāda*, nouns are rather like proper names. They refer to individuals. In *Vt.* XXXV the *ākṛtivāda* is attributed to Vājapyāyana. in *Vt.* XLV the *dravyavāda* is attributed to Vyāḍi. These are the first references to the views mentioned in Sanskrit literature.

Why mention these two views here? The reason is simple. By adopting the *ākṛti*–view the use of the singular ending can be justified, and by adopting the *dravyavāda* we can justify the use of the dual and plural endings. No need of *ekaśeṣa*. The outcome of the discussion is, in fact, that both views are needed. They are not mutually exclusive but rather complementary. As stated by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 246, lines 14–15), *na hy ākṛtipadārthikasya dravyaṃ na padārtho dravyapadārthikasya vākṛtir na padārthaḥ. Ubhayor ubhayaṃ padārthaḥ. Kasyacit tu kiṃcit pradhānabhūtaṃ kiṃcit guṇabhūtam* 'because it is not so that for the advocate of the *akṛti*–view the individual object is not the meaning of the word (and) that for the advocate of the *dravya*–view the common shape is not the meaning of the word. For both (advocates) both (*ākṛti* and *dravya*) are the meaning of the word. Only, for the one (advocate) one thing is the main thing and the other thing is of secondary importance'. Thus for the *ākṛtivādin* the *ākṛti* is the main meaning conveyed by the word–stem and the *dravya* is of minor importance whereas for the *dravyavādin* the reverse holds.

Vts LVIII and LIX finally show how the two views become relevant in solving two major problems. The first is how to justify explanatory wordgroups like *vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca* and *vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca* as referring to two different and many different trees. This is done by adopting the *dravyavāda*. Thereby the objection of *uktārthānām aprayogaḥ* '(words) are not used to denote things which have (already) been expressed' mentioned earlier by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 240, line 25) in connection with *Vt.* XXIX can be avoided. On the other hand, we need the *ākṛtivāda* in the case of homonyms. Earlier, by *Vt.* LII, it had been stated that the *ekaśeṣa*–rule was required in any case to justify like *akṣāḥ* which convey different meanings at the same time. But how exactly is the *ākṛtivāda* applied here? *Vt.* LIX says that homonyms have something in common (*sāmānya*). As explained by

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 247, line 15), it is *kriyā* ' action '. Nāgeśa (on *Bh.* No. 201) explains, *vyāptyādigatasāmānyasya paramparayā dravye sattvena tattajjātiviśiṣṭasya dravyasya vācyatvam* ' on account of the existence, through an intermediary, of a common element consisting in *vyāpti*, " occupying (a certain space) ", etc. in an individual item there is expression of the individual item as qualified by this or that class '. Reference is to the meanings *vyāpti*, etc. assigned to the verbal base *aśU* (*Dhātup.* 5.18), from which the three words *akṣa* are supposedly derived. The idea is that in the different actions performed by a die, an axle and a seed the common element is that they occupy a certain space. This is what all three objects called *akṣa* do. This common element which comes through the intermediary of the different actions of each object forms the basis for the use of the single word *akṣa* for all three of them.

12. Tradition basically assumes that P. 1.2.64 deals with *ekaśeṣa* of *sarūpa* forms which are *samānārtha* ' conveying the same meaning ', in expressions like *vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca*, etc., and as stated by Kātyāyana in *Vt.* XXI. In *Vt.* XXII Kātyāyana has added the case of homonyms, and in *Vt.* XXIII that of synonyms.

13. Tradition assumes a connection of P. 1.2.64 with P. 1.2.58. Patañjali (*PASPA*, *Bh.* No. 57) says that Pāṇini, when phrasing rules had recourse to both the *ākṛtivāda* and the *dravyavāda*. In P. 1.2.58 the underlying view is the *akṛtivāda* – we note that the rule itself uses the word *jāti* –, whereas in P. 1.2.64 the underlying view is the *dravyavāda*. See also *PASPA*, p. 81. Thus here Patañjali connects the *ekaśeṣa*-technique with the *dravyavāda*.

14. Has P. 1.2 64 (like p. 1.2.58) been rejected by Kātyāyana and Patañjali ? Probably Kātyāyana has rejected it, by saying *vā* ' or rather ' in *Vt.* XXXV. This *Vt.* says *ākṛtyabhidhānād vaikaṃ vibhaktau vājapyāyanaḥ* ' or rather, Vājapyāyana (holds that) one single (word) followed by a *vibhakti* (may refer to two or more items) because (that single word) expresses the *ākṛti* " common shape " '. Kaiyaṭa, in his comment here concludes that the *Vārttikakāra* rejects the *ekaśeṣa*–procedure (see under 11). But Patañjali does not say whether, according to him, Kātyāyana rejects P. 1.2.64, or whether he himself also discards it.

15. A strong argument in favour of the *ākṛti|jāti–vāda* is put by *Vt.* XXXIX. This *Vt.* says *dharmaśāstraṃ ca tathā* ' and (also) similarly *dharmaśāstra* '. As explained by Kaiyaṭa here (on *Bh.* No. 134 on P. 1.2.64), the authors of the *smṛtis* go about their business by taking into account *jāti* as the meaning of words. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 242, line 25) quotes two

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

examples, *brāhmaṇo na hantavyaḥ* 'a brahmin/brahmins is/are not to be killed' and *surā na peyā* 'liquor should not be drunk'. Here the words *brāhmaṇaḥ* and *surā* have a generic reference. Thereby reference to all individual instances belonging to the given class is implied. The negation of 'all' is : not any.

Vt. XLVII states an argument in favour of the *dravyavāda*, namely, *codanāsu ca tasyārambhāt* 'and also (words refer to individuals) because (they are) applied to that (individual) in injunctions'. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 244, lines 14–15) quotes the examples *gaur anubandhyaḥ* 'a bull is to be bound (to the post)', and *ajo 'gnīṣomīyaḥ* 'a (male) goat is to be dedicated to Agni and Soma'. Here reference can only be to a particular bull or goat.

16. From the discussion the following points emerge :

a. *Ekaśeṣa* is a technique –presumably developed by *dravyavādins* – to solve the problem of dual and plural reference by a word, given a very particular view of how dual and plural reference is to be expressed. In this view it is assumed that reference to two or more objects requires the repitition of the lexical stem concerned. The limit is put at two repetitions. Therefore to take wordgroups like *vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca* and *vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca*, where *ca* is indicative of simultaneous reference, as the startingpoint of the *ekaśeṣa*–operation follows naturally from the original assumption. These wordgroups themselves are not the actual usage, but they are explanatory wordgroups of usages like *vṛkṣau* and *vṛkṣāḥ*, rather like addition in arithmetics : one plus one is two, etc.

The same technique is applied in the case of homonyms, though here, in addition to the number–problem, we have that of different meanings, and in the case of elliptic duals and plurals which come under P. 1.2.65–73. Here it is assumed that, somehow, the meanings of the lexical stems removed by *ekaśeṣa* become part of the meaning of the remaining stem. The result is that a word like *akṣāḥ*, when used by itself becomes ambiguous. It may refer to a die, an axle and a seed, but it may also refer to three or more items of each kind. The meaning intended can become clear from a context only.

b. *Ekaśeṣa* as a word–derivation technique (*vṛtti*) is alien to Pāṇini's derivation technique as known from the *kṛt*–and *tiṅ*–sections. But we note that it shows a limited similarity to Pāṇini's use of zero–suffixes, as already noted by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 241, lines 3–5); to the *lup*–deletion technique applied in the *taddhita*–section of the *A.*; and to Kātyāyana's doctrine of *uttarapadalopisamāsa*. In the first two cases suffixes conveying categorical grammatical meanings are introduced and subsequently deleted, but their meanings are

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

retained and are integrated in the meaning conveyed by the word-stem. In the latter case, for which see *BDA*, Introduction, p. xxii–xxiii, a lexical item is introduced in the derivation of *tatpuruṣa* cps in order to account for the syntactic connection of the cp. constituents, and subsequently deleted. Its meaning, however, is integrated in the meaning conveyed by the cp. stem. But as argued in S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen 1983, it is rather doubtful whether the *taddhita*-section can be said to originate from Pāṇini, and, as stated in *BDA*, Introduction, p. xxiii. Pāṇini's technique of *lopa* only concerns grammatical or syntactic elements, not lexical items.

c. The basic assumption of *ekaśeṣa*-repetition of lexical items to account for number-is wrong. Number is conveyed by suffixes which have other functions as well. Pāṇini's prescription to this effect has been stated by P. 1.2.21–22.

d. The case of homonyms has also been misconstrued by tradition. Homonymy is not based on the presence of a common meaning-element in the homonyms concerned.

e. As stated by Patañjali, the *ākṛtivāda* and the *dravyavāda* are not mutually exclusive. This is correct. But the reason is that these two views deal with different linguistic facts. The *ākṛtivāda* is concerned with word-meaning, the *dravyavāda*, on the other hand, with reference, that is, the application of meaning to individuals. These two facts should be kept separate. The matter is not merely one of emphasis.

1.2.65 VṚDDHO YUNĀ TALLAKṢAṆAŚ CED EVA VIŚEṢAḤ ' (a word ending in a suffix signifying a descendant called) *vṛddha* (mentioned) together with (a word ending in a suffix signifying a descendant called) *yuvan* (is the only item retained, but) only if the difference (between the two words concerned) is caused by those (*vṛddha*- and *yuvan*- meanings of the suffixes involved)'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. It prescribes the formation of an elliptic dual, and thereby excludes *dvandva* cp. formation.

2. The word *ekaśeṣaḥ* (but see under 3) is continued from P. 1.2.64. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya* any other previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are cancelled. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, canvention 4.

The rule as a whole forms the *uddeśya*. The *vidheya* is *ekaśeṣaḥ*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

3. According to the *KV*, the item continued from P. 1.2 64 is *śeṣaḥ*. Compare *Vt.* I on P. 1.2.69 which uses the word *śeṣaḥ*. It is probably assumed that, since the question is of two words, only one can be retained. Therefore the mention of *eka* in *ekaśeṣaḥ* is not required here. In any case, whether we continue *śeṣaḥ* or *ekaśeṣaḥ*, the effect is the same.

4. The phrasing of the rule is rather different from that of P. 1.2.64. The latter rule uses a genitive–nominative construction (*sarūpāṇām ekaśeṣaḥ*), whereas the present rule used a nominative–instrumental construction (*vṛddho yunā*). The construction with an instrumental word is the pattern used in rules dealing with cp.–formation. In the formulation adopted for P. 1.2.65 the item referred to by the word in the nominative is retained. To make clear that any single form in a sequence like *vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca* can be the item retained, P. 1.2.64 cannot be phrased as *sarūpāḥ sarūpaiḥ ekaśeṣaḥ*, but only as *sarūpāṇām ekaśeṣaḥ*.

5. The words *vṛddha* and *yuvan* have both a non–technical, *laukika* meaning and a technical one. In such a case, *PN*, *pb.* 9 tells us to adopt the technical meaning only, in grammar.

Although the word *vṛddha* has been introduced and defined by P. 1.1.73 as a *saṃjñā*, this term must be different from the word *vṛddha* used in P. 1.2.65. The simple reason is that the term defined in P. 1.1.73 does not offer a contrast with *yuvan*. According to Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 248, line 18), the word *vṛddha* is used in pre–Pāṇinian grammatical works (*pūrvasūtra*) for what is known as *gotra* in the *A*. This latter term has been defined by P. 4.1.162. Reference is generally to a grandson in the scheme of descent comprising three generations, the father, the son and the grandson. The distinction in name between the father on the one hand and his descendants on the other hand is expressed by the use of particular suffixes in the latter case. For instance, if the father is called Garga, the son would be called Gārgi (P. 4.1.95), and the grandson Gārgya (P. 4.1.105). Compare V. S. Agrawala 1963, p. 86, 94.

The word *yuvan* which in its non–technical sense means 'youngster' is technically defined by P. 4.1.163. As explained by the *KV* here, *yuvan* is the name applied to a fourth generation family–member, a great–grandson, provided that an ancestor in one of the three preceding generations is still alive. The fourth generation descendant of Garga, Garga IV, so to speak, will be called Gārgyāyaṇa (P. 4.1.101), a derivation from the *gotra*–name *gārgya*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

6. As stated by the *KV*, the instrumental case ending of *yunā* is used in the sense of *sahayoga* 'connection with *saha*'. That is to say, it conveys the sense of 'together with'. Compare *SK*, No. 564 on P. 2.3.19, *vināpi tadyogaṃ tṛtīyā* 'even without (the use of the word *saha*) the instrumental case ending expresses connection with that (word *saha*)'. By way of proof the *SK* then refers to P. 1.2.65.

We note that "mentioned together" refers to the meaning-explanatory wordgroup of the actual form used in speech.

7. *Lakṣaṇa* in *tallakṣaṇa* is explained by the *KV* as a synonym of *nimitta* 'cause': The constituent *tad* refers to the suffixes involved in the formation of the two words concerned.

8. According to the *KV*, *viśeṣa* means *vairūpya* 'difference in form'. It is further explained that, given a common *ākṛti* 'base-form' (like *garga*) the difference consists in the suffixes used in the sense of *gotra* and *yuvan*. As is clear from the use of *eva* in the *sūtra*, the suffixes should convey that sense only, not any other sense.

The expression *samānāyām ākṛtau* 'given a common *ākṛti*' comes from Paṭañjali (*Mbh*. I, p. 247, line 20)

9. One of the two examples offered by the *KV* is *gārgyaś ca gārgyāyaṇaś ca* 'the third and fourth generation descendant of Garga'. Since here the difference in form consists in the suffixes added in the sense of *gotra* and *yuvan* exclusively, we can apply *ekaśeṣa*. The form derived is *gārgyau*.

10. The significance of the word *eva* in the *sūtra* is brought out by the *KV* with the help of the counter-example *bhāgavittiś ca bhāgavittikaś ca* Here *bhāgavitti* is the name of the *gotra*-descendant, whereas *bhāgavittika* is the name of the *yuvan*-descendant. The *yuvan*-word is derived with the help of the suffix *ṬHaK*, by P. 4.1.147. Now the point is that this suffix, in addition to the meaning of *yuvan*-descendant, also conveys the sense of *kutsana* 'contempt'. Since, therefore, the suffix does not exclusively convey the sense of *yuvan*, P. 1.2.65 forbids the application of *ekaśeṣa* here. Accordingly, we are not supposed to derive the form *bhāgavittī* in the sense indicated.

11. We note that the terms *gotra* and *yuvan* are first introduced as conditions for the addition of suffixes, by P. 4.1.93–94. The definitions of *gotra* and *yuvan*, however, come much later, by P. 4.1.162–163. Logically, we would expect the reverse order, the definitions first.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.2.66. (a) ṢTRĪ 'a feminine (word denoting a *gotra*–descendant mentioned together with a word ending in a suffix signifying a *yuvan*–descendant is the only item retained, but only if the difference between the two words concerned is caused by those (*vṛddha*–and *yuvan*–meanings of the suffixes involved) '.

1. The rule translated here is not P. 1.2.66 in its traditional wording. We propose to divide this rule into two rules, as follows :

P. 1.2.66 (a) *strī*

P. 1.2.66 (b) *puṃvac ca.*

The reasons for this division of the text are three. First, the (a) and (b) rules have different *vidheyas*, namely, *ekaśeṣaḥ* and *puṃvat* respctively. Secondly, the word *ca* should not occur after the second word of a *sūtra*. Thirdly, the only function which can be reasonably assigned to the word *ca* here is that of boundary marker.

We note that questions of *anuvṛtti*–procedure are independent of questions of Pāṇinian or non–Pāṇinian origin of *sūtras.*

2. This is a *vidhisūtra.* It prescribes the formation of an elliptic dual, and thereby excludes *dvandva* cp. formation.

3. In P. 1.2.66 (a) the whole previous rule is continued, with *liṅgaviparināma* 'change of gender' for the word *vṛddha* which becomes *vṛddhā* in agreement with the word *strī*.

The *uddeśya* is *strī vṛddhā yūnā tallakṣaṇaś ced eva viśeṣaḥ.* The *vidheya* is *ekaśeṣaḥ* (or *śeṣaḥ* : see P. 1.2.65, under 3).

4. One example offered by the *KV* (compare Patañjali, *Mbh.* I, p. 248, line 2) is *gārgī ca gārgyāyaṇaś ca* 'a third generation female and a fourth generation male descendant of Garga ', another explanatory wordgroup. Since here the difference in form consists in the suffixes added in the sense of *gotra* and *yuvan* exclusively, we can apply *ekaśeṣa*. For the form derived see P. 1.2.66 (b), under 6.

5. Is P. 1.2.66 (a) required as a special prescription ? Can't we manage by P. 1.2.65 ? The answer is no, for two reasons. The first is that a fem. word like *gārgī* does not end in a *gotra* suffix, but in a fem. suffix. The second is that in expressions like *gārgī ca gārgyāyaṇaś ca*, apart from the *gotra–yuvan* difference, we have an additional difference, namely, that of gender.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.2.66 (b) **PUṂVAC CA** 'and (that feminine sense) is treated like the masculine'.

1. For the proposed division of P. 1.2.66 see P. 1.2.66 (a), under 1.

2. This is an *atideśasūtra* 'rule of transference' prescribing *puṃvadbhāva* 'treatment like the masculine'

In relation to P. 1.2.66 (a), the (b) rule may be regarded as an associative digression. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, P. 277, convention 83 (iv).

3. The words *strī vṛddhā yūnā* from P. 1.2.66 (a) are continued. The word *ekaśeṣaḥ* from P. 1.2.64 is discontinued by the new, incompatible *vidheya*–item *puṃvat*. The rest of P. 1.2.66 (a) is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*. That is to say, its continuation here serves no purpose. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 45–46.

The *uddeśya* is *strī vṛddhā yūnā*. The *vidheya* is *puṃvat*.

4. For the function of the word *ca* see P. 1.2.66 (a), under 1.

5. The suffix *vat* (P. 5.1.118) indicates *atideśa* 'transference'. See *ATA*, fn. 1.

6. By treating *gārgī* in *gārgī ca gārgyāyaṇaś ca* as a masculine we practically replace it by the corresponding masculine form *gārgya*. Thus the form derived is *gārgyau*.

7. Patañjali (*Mbh*. I, P. 247, lines 22–23) raises the question whether the word *strī* in the *sūtra* is to be understood as *strīpratyaya* 'a fem. suffix', or as *stryartha* 'a fem. meaning', or as *strīśabda* 'a fem. word'. The first alternative would result in the prohibition of P. 2.4.64 while deriving the pl. nom. *gargāḥ* in the sense of *gārgī ca gārgyāyaṇau* 'the third generation female and the two fourth generation male descendants of Garga', where the application of P. 2.4.64 is desired. The third alternative would result in the prohibition of P. 6.1.103 while deriving the pl. acc. *gargān* in the sense noted above, where the application of this rule is desired. Therefore Patañjali opts for the second alternative by saying *yathā na doṣas tathāstu* 'let us adopt that way in which no shortcoming arises' (*Mbh*. I, p. 248, line 3).

1.2.67 **PUMĀN STRIYĀ** 'a masculine (word mentioned) together with a feminine (word is the only item retained, but only if the difference between the two words concerned is caused by the gender conveyed by those suffixes involved.)'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. It prescribes the formation of an elliptic dual, and thereby excludes *dvandva* cp. formation.

2. As stated by the *KV*, the words *vṛddho yūnā* from P. 1.2.65 are discontinued. The reason of the discontinuation lies in the introduction of the new, incompatible items *pumān striyā*. Patanjali (*Mbh*. I, p. 248, line 9) explicitly mentions the continuation of the phrase *tallakṣaṇaś ced eva viśeṣaḥ* from P. 1.2.65. The word *ekaśeṣaḥ* in continued from P. 1.2.64. The *KV* presumably continues *śeṣaḥ* instead, See P. 1.2.65, under 3.

The *uddeśya* is *pumān striyā tallakṣaṇaś ced eva viśeṣaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *ekaśeṣaḥ*.

3. For the nominative– instrumental construction of the rule see P. 1.2.65, under 4.

4. For the instrumental ending in *striyā* see P. 1.2.65, under 6.

5. The two explanatory wordgroup–examples offered by the *KV* are *brāhmaṇaś ca brāhmaṇī ca* 'a brahmin man and a brahmin woman', and *kukkuṭaś ca kukkuṭī ca* 'a cock and a hen'. Here the fem. words are formed with the fem. suffix *ṄīṢ*, by P. 4.1.63. Since the difference in form between the two words concerned consists in gender only, as is clear from the rule by which *ṄīṢ* is added, *ekaśeṣa* is allowed. The forms derived are *brāhmaṇau* and *kukkuṭau* respectively.

6. To bring out the significance of the expression *tallakṣaṇaś ced viśeṣaḥ* the *KV* quotes the counter-example *kukkuṭas ca mayūrī ca* 'a cock and a peahen'. As explained by the *Nyāsa* here, the example shows not only a difference in gender, but also a difference in word–stem. See P. 1.2.65, under 8.

7. To show the significance of the word *eva* (in *tallakṣaṇaś ced eva viśeṣaḥ*), the *KV* quotes the counter–example *indras ca indrāṇī ca* '*Indra* and *indrāṇī*'. The point is that the word *indrāṇī* is derived with the suffix *ṄīṢ* by P. 4.1.49. This suffix, in addition to fem. gender, conveys the sense of *puṃyoga* 'connection with a man' (P. 4.1.48). Here *ekaśeṣa* is not allowed. Therefore the form derived is *indrendrāṇyau*. We note that in *indrāṇī* the augment *anūK* is added immediately before *ṄīṢ*, by the same rule P. 4.1.49.

The same point could have been made with the help of the word *brāhmaṇī*, if derived with the suffix *ṄīṢ* by P. 4.1.48, in the sense of 'a brahmin housewife'. In that case, the form derived in the sense of 'a brahmin and a brahmin housewife' will be *brāhmaṇabrāhmaṇyau*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.2.68 BHRĀTṚPUTRAU SVASṚDUHITṚBHYĀM '(the words) *bhrātṛ* "brother" and putra "son" (mentioned) together with (the words) *svasṛ* "sister" and *duhitṛ* "daughter" (respectively are the only items retained)'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. It prescribes the formation of an elliptic dual and thereby prohibits *dvandva* cp. formation.

2. The word *ekaśeṣaḥ* (or *śeṣaḥ*; see P. 1.2.65, under 3) is continued with *saṃkhyāviparīṇāma* 'change of number', as *ekaśeṣau*, in agreement with *bhrātṛputrau*. As explained by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 248, lines 12–13), the phrase *tallakṣaṇaś ced eva viśeṣaḥ* cannot be continued in the present rule, because, in addition to the gender difference, the examples for this rule show a difference in word-stem. The words *pumān striyā* from P. 1.2.67 are discontinued by the introduction of the incompatible items *bhrātṛputrau svasṛduhitṛbhyām*.

The *uddeśya* is the rule itself. The *vidheya* is *ekaśeṣau*.

3. As stated by the *KV*, the *pb.* P. 1.3.10 becomes applicable for the interpretation of P. 1.2.68. It tells us that the constituents of the two *dvandva* cps are to be connected in a one to one correspondence. Compare also Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 278, convention 95.

4. For the nominative–instrumental construction see P. 1.2.65, under 4.

5. For the use of the instrumental ending see P. 1.2.65, under 6.

6. The wordgroup-examples offered by the *KV* are *bhrātā ca svasā ca* 'the brother and the sister', and *putraś ca duhitā ca* 'the son and the daughter'. The forms derived by the *ekaśeṣa*-operation are *bhrātarau* and *putrau* respectively.

7. Kātyāyana, *Vt.* I on the present rule, thinks that the rules P. 1.2.65–67 are not required, and that we can manage by P. 1.2.64 itself. To do so, Kātyāyana invokes the *sāmānya*-principle mentioned in *Vt.* LIX on P. 1.2.64. In the examples quoted for the three rules stated above, what is desired to be expressed is *sāmānya* 'a common factor'. The common factor referred to may be found in descent from one and the same ancestor, like in the case of *gārgyau* (P. 1.2.65–66), or in a shared class/caste, like in the case of *brāhmaṇau* (P. 1.2.67). Patañjali agrees.

8. The examples for P. 1.2.68 cannot come under P. 1.2.67, because, as stated above, under 2, in the latter rule the phrase *tallakṣaṇaś ced eva viśeṣaḥ* is continued. The point is that the examples for P. 1.2.68 show a different word-stem also.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

9. The discontinuation of the phrase *tallakṣaṇaś ced eva viśeṣaḥ* in the present rule and its continuation again in P. 1.2.69 (a) show a disturbance in the flow of *anuvṛtti*. This disturbance could have been avoided, if the word *nityam* (in P. 1.2.72) is shifted, and if the order of rules is assumed to be as follows :

a. *pumān striyā* (*tallakṣaṇaś ced eva viśeṣaḥ*) (P. 1.2.67).

b. *napuṃsakam anapuṃsakena* (*tallakṣaṇaś ced eva viśeṣaḥ*) (P. 1.2.69 (a)).

c. *ekavac cāsyānyatarasyām* (P. 1.2.69 (b)).

d. *pitā mātrā* (*anyatarasyām*) (P. 1.2.70).

e. *śvaśuraḥ śvaśrvā* (*anyatarasyām*) (P. 1.2.71).

f. *bhrātṛputrau svasṛduhitṛbhyām nityam* (P. 1.2.68).

g. *tyadādīni sarvaiḥ* (*nityam*) (1.2.72).

1.2.69 (a) NAPUṂSAKAM ANAPUṂSAKENA 'a neuter (word mentioned) together with a non-neuter (word is the only item retained, but only if the difference, between the two words concerned is caused by the gender conveyed by those suffixes involved) '.

1. The rule translated here is not P. 1.2.69 in its traditional wording. We propose to divide this rule into two rules, as follows :

P. 1.2.69 (a) *napuṃsakam anapuṃsakena*,

P. 1.269 (b) *ekavac cāsyānyatarasyām*.

The reasons for this division of the text are two. First, the (a) and (b) rules have different *vidheyas*, namely, *ekaśeṣaḥ* and *ekavad anyatarasyām* respectively. Secondly, the only function which can be reasonably assigned to *ca* here is that of boundary marker.

2. This is a *vidhisūtra*. It prescribes *ekaśeṣa*, and thereby prohibits the formation of a *dvandva* cp.

3. The word *ekaśeṣaḥ*, (or *śeṣaḥ*; see P. 1.2.65, under 3) is continued from P. 1.2.64. As stated by the *KV*, the phrase *tallakṣaṇaś ced eva viśeṣaḥ* is continued from P. 1.2.65. Given its discontinuation in P. 1.2.68, what we have in P. 1.2.69 (a) is an instance of *maṇḍūkapluti*. This implies that the flow of *anuvṛtti* has been disturbed. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 208; and see P. 1.2.68, under 9. The words *bhrātṛputrau svasṛduhitṛbhyām* from P. 1.2.68 are cancelled by the incompatible items *napuṃsakam anapuṃsakena*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The *uddeśya* is *napuṃsakam anapuṃsakena*. The *vidheya* is *ekaśeṣaḥ*.

4. For the nominative–instrumental construction see P. 1.2.65, under 4.

5. For the use of the instrumental ending see P. 1.2.65, under 6.

6. The wordgroup–example offered by the *KV* and borrowed from Patañjali (*Mbh*. I, p. 249, line 23) is *śuklaś ca kambalaḥ śuklā ca bṛhatikā śuklaṃ ca vastram* 'a white shawl and a white loose overgarment and a white dress'. For the two forms derived see P. 1.2.69 (b), under 6.

1.2.69 (b) ĘKAVAC CĀṢYĀNYATARASYĀM 'and that (neuter word) is indifferently treated like a singular'

1. For the proposed division of P. 1.2.69 see P. 1.2.69 (a), under 1.

2. This is an *atideśasūtra* 'rule of transference', prescribing *ekavadbhāva* 'treatment like a singular', by way of option.

In relation to P. 1.2.69 (a), the (b) rule may be regarded as an associative digression. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 277, convention 83 (iv).

3. The word *napuṃsakam* from P. 1.2.69 (a) is continued. The word *ekaśeṣaḥ* from P. 1.2.64 is discontinued by the new, incompatible *vidheya*–item *ekavat*. The rest of P. 1.2.69 (a) is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*. That is to say, its continuation serves no purpose. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 45–46.

The *uddeśya* is *napuṃsakam*. The *vidheya* is *ekavad anyatarasyām*.

4. For the function of the word *ca* see P. 1.2.69 (a), under 1.

5. The suffix *vat* (P. 5.1.118) indicates *atideśa* 'transference'. See *ATA*, fn. 1.

6. Since the words *śuklaḥ*, *śuklā* and *śuklam* in the wordgroup–example (see P. 1.2.69 (a), under 6) differ in gender only, *ekaśeṣa* is allowed. The forms derived are either the neuter pl. *śuklāni* 'white things', or the neuter sg. *śuklam* in the same meaning.

7. According to *Vt*. II on the present rule, the prescription of optional *ekavadbhāva* is not required, because we have that by assuming that *ākṛti* 'common shape' is expressed, apparently in the form of a common, visible colour.

As a matter of fact, the prescription of *ekavadbhāva* is not required, because we can manage to have the singular by assuming *jātyekavacana* (P. 1.2.58).

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.2.70 PITĀ MĀTRĀ (the word) *pitṛ* "father" (mentioned) together with (the word) *mātṛ* "mother" (is indifferently the only item retained)'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. It prescribes an elliptic dual optionally, thereby also optionally allowing the formation of a *dvandva* cp.

2. The word *ekaśeṣaḥ* (or *śeṣaḥ*; see P. 1.2.65, under 3) is continued from P. 1.2.64. According to the *KV*, the word *anyatarasyām* is continued, namely, from P. 1.2.69 (b). Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 272, convention 24. The words *napuṃsakam anapuṃsakena* from P. 1.2.69 (a) are discontinued by the incompatible items *pitā mātrā*. Items belonging to an associative digression (P. 1.2.69 (b)) are discontinued in the next rule.

The *uddeśya* is *pitā mātrā*. The *vidheya* is *ekaśeṣaḥ anyatarasyām*.

3. For the nominative–instrumental construction see P. 1.2.65, under 4.

4. For the use of the instrumental ending see P. 1.2.65, under 6.

5. The wordgroup–example offered by the *KV* is *mātā ca pitā ca* 'the mother and the father'. The *ekaśeṣa*–operation results in the form *pitarau*. The optional dvandva cp. is *mātāpitarau*, by P. 2.2.29. The order of the constituents is by *Vt.* IV on P. 2.2.30. Further, to have the form *mātā*, P. 6.3.25 and P. 8.2.7 are applied.

1.2.71 ŚVAŚURAḤ ŚVAŚRVĀ '(the word) *śvaśura* "father-in-law" (mentioned) together with (tbe word) *śvaśrū* "mother-in-law" (is indifferently the only item retained)'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. It prescribes an elliptic dual optionlly, thereby also optionally allowing *dvandva* cp. formation.

2. The word *ekaśeṣaḥ* (or *śeṣaḥ*; see P. 1.2.65, under 3) is continued from P. 1.2.64. According to the *KV*, the word *anyatarasyām* is continued, namely, from P. 1.2.69 (b). Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 272, convention 24. The words *pitā mātrā* are discontinued by the incompatible items *śvaśuraḥ śvaśrvā*.

The *uddeśya* is *śvaśuraḥ śvaśrvā*. The *vidheya* is *ekaśeṣaḥ anyatarasyām*.

3. For the nominative–instrumental construction see P. 1.2.65, under 4.

4. For the use of the instrumental ending see P. 1.2.65, under 6.

5. The wordgroup–example offered by the *KV* is *śvaśuraś ca śvaśrūś ca* 'the father-in-law and the mother-in-law.' According to the Nyāsa, the order of the constituents is by *Vt.* IV on P. 2.2.30 again.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

6. According to the Kielhorn edition of the *Mbh.*, there is a common *bhāṣya* on P. 1.2.68, 70 and 71. The *NSP* ed. has a common *bhāṣya* on the latter two rules only. The *bhāṣya* opens with the question why these rules are required. Here reference is to P. 1.2.68 also, as is clear from *Vt.* I. Why can't we menage by P. 1.2.67 itself (*Mbh.* I, p. 250, line 13)? Apparently, Patañjali has forgotten that P. 1.2 67 has been declared redundant. See P. 1.2.68, under 7.

The answer to Patañjali's question is, of course, that P. 1.2.67 deals with masculine and feminine forms which share an identical word-stem. Then how to apply this to the examples quoted for P. 1 2.68, 70 and 71 ? Kātyāyana's fanciful solution, as stated in *Vt.* I, is that these examples can come under P. 1.2.67, if it is assumed that the feminine words used in the examples have the same cause of application (*tulyakāraṇa*) as the masculine words. Thus, what is the cause of application of the words *bhrātṛ* 'brother', *putra* 'son', *pitṛ* 'father' and *śvaśura* 'father-in-law' to the individuals named *bhrātṛ*, etc. is also the cause of application of the corresponding different wordforms *svasṛ* 'sister', etc. But what could be this common cause of application ? To show this, Patañjali indulges in etymologies based on *uṇādi-sūtras* (*Mbh.* I, p. 250, 18–20).

The argument is far-fetched and based on grammatical fancy only. To have the forms desired, the three rules in question are necessary.

1.2.72 TYADĀDÍNI SARVAIR NITYAM '(the pronouns) *tyad*, etc. (mentioned) together with any (nominal or pronominal form are) invariably (the only item retained) '.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. It prescribes *ekaśeṣa* of pronominal forms.

2. The word *ekaśeṣaḥ* (or *śeṣaḥ*; see P. 1.2.65, under 3) is continued from P. 1.2.64. The word *anyatarasyām* from P. 1.2.69 (b) is discontinued by the mention of *nityam*. The words *śvaśurah śvaśrvā* are cancelled by the incompatible items *tyadādīni sarvaiḥ*.

The *uddeśya* is *tyadādīni sarvaiḥ*. The *vidheya* is *ekaśeṣaḥ nityam*.

3. For the nominative-instrumental construction see P. 1.2.65, under 4.

4. For the use of the instrumental ending see P. 1.2.65, under 6.

5. *Tyadādīni* refers to a subgroup of the *sarvādi-gaṇa* (P. 1.1.27). It consists of twelve pronominal stems including the numerals *eka* and *dvi* which show a pronominal inflection.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

6. The word *sarvaiḥ* is explained by the *KV* as referring to the *tyadādi* pronouns themselves and to other (nominal) stems. The *KV* further explains the meaning of the word *sarva* here as *sākalya* 'totality'. Thus the rule comes to mean that the *tyadādi* forms mentioned together with any pronominal or nominal form whatsoever are the only items retained.

7. The wordgroup-examples offered by the *KV* and obviously based on the example quoted by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 251, line 10) are *sa ca devadattaś ca* 'he and Devadatta', and *yaś ca devadattaś ca* '(he) who and Devadatta'. The forms resulting from the *ekaśeṣa*-operation are *tau* 'they both' and *yau* '(they) who both' respectively.

It may be observed, however, that the explanatory wordgroups postulated for the pronominal forms *tau* and *yau* are questionable. It is not at all clear why, for instance, *tau* is to be explained as *sa ca devadattaś ca*. Strictly, the explanation ought to be *sa ca sa ca* 'he and he'. It follows that the *ekaśeṣa*-operation can be applied by P. 1.2.64 (*sarūpāṇām*) itself. If the explanatory wordgroup is assumed to be *sa ca sā ca* 'he and she', we can manage by P. 1.2.67. If the wordgroup is to be phrased as *sa ca tac ca* 'he and that', we can manage by P. 1.2.69. The conclusion is that P. 1.2.72 is totally redundant. The reason why tradition insists that *sarvaiḥ* should be taken to refer to both nominal and pronominal stems is that the examples for P. 1.2.72 cannot come under P. 1.2.64, because the forms mentioned are *asarūpa* 'dissimilar in form'. Thereby P. 1.2.72 can be justified as a rule in its own right.

8. Kātyāyana, in *Vt.* I on the present rule, explicitly prescribes the masculine and neuter gender for wordgroups containing a fem. word. Here Patañjali quotes the examples *sā ca devadattaś ca* 'she and Devadatta', and *sā ca kuṇḍe ca* 'she and the two pots'. The forms resulting from the *ekaśeṣa*-operation are *tau* 'they both' (du. masc.) and *tāni* 'they' (pl. ntr.). In *Vt.* II Kātyāyana phrases a prohibition of the masc. and ntr. gender for the *tyadādi* forms when qualifying a *dvandva* or *tp.* cp. which is fem. by P. 2.4.26.

As explained by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 251, line 15), Kātyāyana, in *Vt.* III on P. 1.2.72, says that the present rule is redundant, because the *tyadādi* forms have reference in common with non-pronominal forms. The idea is that pronominal forms may be used to refer to anything whatsoever. Because a pronominal and a non-pronominal form have something in common *ekaśeṣa* can be applied. Accordingly, the pronominal form which has assumed the reference of the non-pronominal form in addition to its own reference, is retained.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

9. The *KV* mentions a statement which says *tyadādīnām mitho yad yat paraṃ tat tac chiṣyate* 'of the *tyadādi* (forms) among themselves that (form) is the only item retained which comes later (in the enumeration of the *tyadādi-gaṇa*)'. The statement has been quoted earlier by Patañjali (*Mbh*. I, p. 352, line 14) without the word *mithas*.

The wordgroup-examples offered by the *KV* are *sa ca yaś ca* 'he and (he) who', and *yaś ca kaś ca* '(he) who and who ?'. The forms resulting from the *ekaśeṣa* operation are *yau* and *kau* respectively. The point is that in the order of enumeration of the *tyadādi*-group *yad* comes after *tad*, and *kim* comes after *yad*.

Here the same objection holds which was made in connection with the wordgroup *sa ca devadattaś ca* (see under 7). *Yau* and *kau* can be derived by means of *ekaśeṣa* from *yaś ca yaś ca*, and *kaś ca kaś ca* only. Here P. 1.2.64 applies. Therefore the statement quoted above is also redundant.

1.2.73 GRĀMYAPAŚUSAṄGHEṢV ATARUṆEṢU STRĪ 'when the question is of (nouns signifying) herds of tame animals which are not young, the feminine (word is the only item retained).

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. It prescribes *ekaśeṣa* of the fem. word, as an exception to P. 1.2.67.

2. The word *ekaśeṣaḥ* is continued from P. 1.2.64. Any other previous *uddeśya* and *vidheya* items are cancelled by the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya*.

The *uddeśya* is *grāmyapaśusaṅgheṣu ataruṇeṣu*. The *vidheya* is *ekaśeṣaḥ strī*.

3. The nominative-instrumental construction adopted in P. 1.2.65-72 has been abandoned. This by itself may be taken as an indication that P. 1.2.73 comes from a different source than the sequence P. 1.2.65-72. This impression is further strengtened by noting that the nominative word (*strī*) comes at the end of the rule, and by taking into account that the rule has been put at the end of a *pada*, a handy place for inserting rules. Being an exception to P. 1 2.67, the rule should have come immediately after P. 1.2.67.

4. The words *grāmyapaśusaṅgheṣu ataruṇeṣu* represent a *viṣayasaptamī* 'a locative ending indicating the sphere or domain (in which a grammatical operation is to be applied)'. See *TA*, fn. 165.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. As noted by the *KV*, the meaning *ataruṇeṣu* is to be connected with the cp. constituent *paśu*, because otherwise it would not make sense (*sāmarthyāt*).

6. As regards *grāmyapaśu* ' domesticated animals ' as distinct from *āraṇyāḥ paśavaḥ* ' wild animals ' see V. S. Agrawala 1963, p. 218.

7. As stated by Kaiyaṭa in his introductory remark on P. 1.2.73 and in his comment on *Bh.* No. 3 on the same rule, the idea of the *sūtra* is that the fem. word only is used to refer to a herd consisting of male and female animals, because the majority of the herd is female.

8. The examples offered by the *KV* and borrowed from Patañjali (*Mbh* I, p. 252, line 13, where *caranti* ' they graze ' is added) are *gāva imāḥ* ' these cows', and *ajā imāḥ* ' these goats '.

The explanatory wordgroups in which *ekaśeṣa* is applied have not been mentioned, but can easily be supplied as *gauś ca gāvaś ca* ' the bull and the cows ', and *ajaś ca ajāś ca* ' the he-goat and the she-goats '. In the examples the pronouns have been added to indicate fem. gender.

9. The *KV* mentions a *bhāṣyavārttika* (*Mbh.* I, p. 252, line 23) which imposes a restriction on P. 1.2.73. The *bhāṣyavārttika* says *anekaśapheṣv iti vaktavyam* ' (the rule) should state *anekaśapheṣu* " when the question is of cloven-hoofed (animals) " '. The counterexamples provided by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 252, line 23) are *aśvāś caranti* ' the horses graze ' and *gardabhāś caranti* ' the donkeys graze '. That is to say, herds consisting of mares and stallions are referred to by masc. forms only.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

INDEX OF SANSKRIT TERMS

The following index contains Sanskrit terms that have been defined or discussed in the introduction, translation and notes. Words are listed in the order of Sanskrit Syllabary.

akaraṇa 59
akālaka 99
akṛta 21
akṣa 109, 115
akṣaśauṇḍa 75
agna āyāhi vītaye 62
agnir mūrddhā divaḥ kakut 60
ajaś ca ajāś ca 131
ajātivacana 91
ajo'gnīṣomīyaḥ 117
aṇutā khasya 48, 50
atantra 54
atideśa 122, 126
atideśasūtra 1, 14, 122
ato devā avantu naḥ 62
adyatana 100
adhikaraṇa 72
adhyagīṣṭa 1
adhyardha 54
anavakāśa 9
aniṣṭasiddha 87
anīK 123
anukaraṇamantra 59
anucca 51
anudāttatara 69
anurāga 56
anuvṛtti 125
anekaśapha 131
anaimittika 111
anyatarasyām 31, 105
anvavasarga 51
apamṛṣitaṃ vākyam āha 30
apṛkta 70
abhitta 20
amanaḥprayoga 60
ardhatṛtīya 54
ardhapippalī 74
ardhabhāk 71
ardhahrasva 54
alamkumāriḥ 76
avagraha 68
avyayībhāva 74
avyāpti 116
avyutpatti-avyutpanna-pakṣa 77
avyutpanna 78, 81
aśabda 60
aśiṣya 100, 113
asiddha 65
ahan 80
ahaṃ paṇḍito bravīmi 103
ahaṃ bravīmi 103
ākṛti 120
ākṛtivāda 115, 116, 118
ākṛtivādin 115
ākṛtyabhidhānāt 116
āgaccha bho māṇavaka devadattā3 57
ātmanepade 19
ātmanepadeṣu 19
ādikarman 30
ādibhūtakriyākṣaṇa 30
ābhyantara 50
āmalaka 86, 89
āmro vṛkṣaḥ 91
āyāma 48, 49, 50
ārdhadhātuka 7
āhata 24
iṆ 41
indraś ca indrāṇī ca 123

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

indrendrāṇyau 123
indh– 11
imaṃ me gaṅge 55
imaṃ me gaṅge yamune 67, 69
iyaso bahuvrīhau puṃvadvacanam 84
iṣṭasiddhi 87
uktārthānām aprayogaḥ 113, 115
uccatā 49
uccaiḥ 47
uttamarājya 73
uttarapadalopasamāsa 117
udāttaśruti 55
udāyaṃsta pādam 25
udāyata 24
uditau tiṣyapunarvasū dṛśyete 107
uddeśya 1, 118, 121, 122, 123, 126
udvijitā 3
unnīca 52
upadeśa 9, 44, 47, 56, 67
upasarjana 74, 76, 85, 100
upāṃśuprayoga 59
upāsthita 27
urutā khasya 51
uṣitvā 13
uṣṭramukha 43
ūrdhvabhāga 49
ekamātrika 44
ekavad anyatarasyām 125, 126
ekavadbhāva 126
ekavibhakti 75
ekaśeṣa 108, 110, 113, 114, 117, 121, 125, 129
ekaśruti 55, 56, 60
eva 79
aupagavam ānaya 98
aupadeśika 8, 15
K 8
kapittha 79
karaṇa 59
karaṇamantra 59
karaṇavat 60
karmasādhana 110
kaṣṭaśrita 74
kāṇḍe 80
kāra 61
kāla 99
kāśyapa 39
kittva 14
kukkuṭarute ūkāre 44
kukkuṭaś ca kukkuṭī ca 123
kukkuṭau 123
kuḍya 80
kuṇḍa 79
kutsana 120
kṛt–117
kṛṣitvā 39
kṛṣīṣṭa 21
ke 50
kva 53
Garga 119
Gārgi 119
gārgī 121, 122
gārgī ca gārgyāyaṇaś ca 121, 122
gārgī ca gārgyāyaṇau 122
Gārgya 119, 122
Gārgyāyaṇa 119
gārgyau 122
guṇavacana 91
gotra 119, 120, 121
go-tva 91
gaur anubandhyaḥ 117
gauś ca gāvaś ca 131
grathitvā 37
grāmya paśusaṃgha 130
ghṛtaspṛk 71
ṆiC 7
ca 20, 32, 75, 80, 90, 96, 99, 102, 104, 106, 122, 125, 126
cicīṣati 16
citragu 83
chandasi 62
japa 58, 60
jāti 91, 116
jātivacana 91
jātivāda 116
jātiśabda 100
jātyekavacana 126
jighṛkṣati 15

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

jyotiṣṭoma 59
ḍittha 79
tat pāṇinir ācāryaḥ pratyācaṣṭe lokato'rthāvagateḥ 94
tatpuruṣa 118
tadantavidhi 15, 20
taddhita 93
tiṅ– 117
titaucchatram 44
tulyakāraṇa 12
tṛṣitvā 39
te 50
tyadādi 129
traisvarya 58, 64
dāruṇya 48
didyutiṣate 42
devadatta gām abhyāja śuklām 79
devā brahmāṇa āgacchata 65
devā marutaḥ pṛśnimātaro'paḥ 69
devitvā 28
dyutitam 31
dyutitvā 41
dravya 115
dravyavacana 91
dravyavāda 115, 116, 117, 118
dravyavādin 115, 117
dvandva 107, 114, 121, 123
dvayor vibhāṣayor madhyavartitvān nityo'yaṃ vidhiḥ syāt 32
dvigu 76
dviyama 52
na 30
napuṃsaka 120
namas te rudra nīlakaṇṭha sahasrākṣa 51
nānāliṅgasaṃkhyāḥ 94
nigada 63
nitya 32
nityatva 12
nityam 125
nityam akittvam idādyoḥ ktvāgrahaṇam uttarārtham 33
nināya 46
nipātana 12
niyama 108
nirdhāraṇaṣaṣṭhī 109
niṣkauśāmbi 76, 83
niṣṭhā 30
nīcabhāga 49, 51
naikaṃ prayojanaṃ yogārambham prayojayati 5
nyūṅkha 60
pañcagu 76
pañcagoṇi 87
pañcasūci 87
pañcāla 89, 92, 96
pañcālāḥ ramaṇīyāḥ bahvannāḥ bahukṣīraghṛtāḥ bahumālyaphalāḥ 92
pañcendra 85
pada 51, 113
paramarājya 73
parasaptamī 85
pavita 35
pavitvā 35
pācakavṛndārikā 73
pācikābhārya 73
pāṭha 58
pāṇinyupajñaṃ akālakaṃ vyākaraṇam 99
pitarau 127
pitṛ 128
pīṭha 79
puṃyoga 123
puṃvat 121
puṃvadbhāva 73, 122
putra 128
putrā īdhe ātharvaṇaḥ 10
putraś ca duhitā ca 124
putrau 124
punaḥśruti 79
punarukti 79
puruṣavyāghra 74
pūrvakāya 74
pūrvanipāta 76
(pūrva) pratiṣedha 9
pūrvavayā brāhmaṇaḥ pratyuttheyaḥ 102
prakṛtipratyayau sahārthaṃ brūtaḥ 98
pracaya 55
pratyaya 70
pratyāyana 101

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

pradhānopasarjane pradhānārtham saha brūtaḥ 97
prāptajīvika 76
babhūva 11
bahuvadbhāva 101
bahuśreyasī 84
bāhya 50
bibhitsati 18
brāhmaṇabrāhmaṇyau 123
brāhmaṇaś ca brāhmaṇī ca 123
brāhmaṇī 123
brāhmaṇau 123
brāhmaṇo na hantavyaḥ 117
bhavati 50
bhāgavitti 120
Bhāradvājīya 33
bhāvavacana 91
bhāvasādhana 110
bhitsīṣṭa 19
bhrātarau 124
bhrātā ca svasā ca 124
bhrātṛ 128
maṇḍūkapluti 62, 67, 125
mathitvā 37
marṣita 30
mahattā 51
māṇavaka jaṭilādhyāpaka kva gamiṣyasi 68, 69
māṇavaka3 māṇavaka 56
mātā ca pitā ca 127
mātāpitarau 127
mātṛ 112
mātrā 44
mārdava 51
mṛṣitvā 39
yājyā 61
yiyakṣati 18
yuktavat 88
yuktavadbhāva 88
yuvan 119, 120, 121
yuṣmad 103
yūpadāru 74
ye 50
yoga 96
yogavibhāga 87
rājapuruṣa 75
rājapuruṣam ānaya 98
rucitaṃ kārṣāpaṇaṃ dadāti 31
ruṇaddhi 6
rūkṣatā 49
rūḍha 97
lakṣaṇa 120
lakṣyaikacatuṣka 40
likhitvā 41
liṅgavipariṇāma 121
lilikhiṣati 42
lup
loka 98
lopa 118
vacana 88
vat 122, 126
vana 80
vayaṃ brūmaḥ 103
varaṇa 96
varṇa 78
vaṣaṭ 61
vā 22, 36, 61
vidhisūtra 118, 124, 125
vidheya 1, 118, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126
vibhakti 112, 113
vibhaktivipariṇāma 17, 53
vibhāga 112
vibhāṣā 4, 25, 26
vivakṣā 130
viśākhe nakṣatram indrāgnī devatā 106
viśeṣa 120
viśeṣaṇa 90, 91
viśeṣya 91
viṣayasaptamī 19, 130
vṛkabhaya 75
vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca 115, 117, 119
vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣāś ca 113, 115, 116, 117
vṛddha 118, 119. 121
vaicitryārtham 61
vairūpya 120
vauṣaṭ 61
vyakti 88

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

vyaktivādin 102
vyavasthitavibhāṣā 31
vyutpatti–vyutpanna–pakṣa 77
śaṅkulākhaṇḍa 74
śaṃ no devīr abhiṣṭaye 63
ŚaP 5, 6
śayita 29
śuklam 126
śuklāni 126
ŚnaM 6
śnā 7
śnu 6
ŚyaN 6
śleṣa 110
ślokakāra 16, 28
ślokavārttikakāra 87
śvaśura 128
śvaśuraś ca śvaśrūś ca 127
śvinna 29
saṃhitā 67
saṃhitāpāṭha 67
saṃkhyāvipariṇāma 124
saṃgaṃsīṣṭa 22
sa ca tat ca 129
sa ca devadattaś ca tau 129
saṁjñā 94, 119
saṃjñānam saṃjñā 94
satiśiṣṭa 52, 53
satsaptamī 85, 101
sannatara 69
samagata 22
samānaprakaraṇa 48
samānādhikaraṇa 72
samāsa 81
samīdhe dasyuhantamam 10
sampannāḥ yavāḥ 101
sampāṭha 58
samprasāraṇa 8
sarvādigaṇa 12
sarvo dvandvo vibhāṣayaikavad bhavati 107
saviśeṣaṇasya pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ 103
sas 46
sahayoga 120
sahavivakṣāyām ekaśeṣah 113
sāman 60
sāmarthya 45, 122, 126
sāmānya 124
sārvadhātuka 4, 5
siddha 2, 9
siddhatva 12
supāṃ ca supo bhavantīti vaktavyam 106
subrahman 64
subrahmaṇyā 63
surā na peyā 117
suvāg brāhmaṇakulam 45
strīpratyaya 122
strīśabda 122
stryartha 122
sthāna 47, 48, 51
sthānyādeśabhāva 20
svarita 52, 83
svasṛ 128
hūta 56

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

INDEX OF ENGLISH TERMS

ablative of cause expressed by an abstract noun 93, 97
adjective 91
agreement 98
agreement in gender and number 93
ākṛti-view 114, 115
anudātta pitch 65
asiddha-principle 68
assertion about a class or species 102
associative digression 25, 26, 45, 47
auditory phonetics 48
boundaries like aṅga, bha and pada 67
case-endings to nipātas 79
categories of words 73
class 114, 115
common shape 115
conformity in gender and number 93, 96
connection with the topic of the preceding rule 104
correspondence of the saṃjñins and the saṃjñās 43
criticism of the lup-deletion technique 93
defence of Pāṇini's derivational procedure 93
defining the meanings 99
delimitation of the domains of grammar 93
dependent svarita 52
derivability of nominal stems 77
derivable nominal stems 81
derivation-technique 117
derivational connection 94
different form but the same meaning 109
dissimilar in form 129
distinction between pradhāna and upasarjana 99
division of articulatory-processes 50
dual form qualifying a sg. noun 83
dvandva-cp 41
ekaśeṣa-procedure 114, 116
elliptic dual 108, 110, 117, 124, 127
etymology 96
explanatory word-group 117
falling tone 52
features of low pitch 51
feminine 121
final vowel of an utterance 57
finished form 113
first place in a cp 73
general concept 'cow' 91
glide from the high-register of voice to the low register of voice 52
glottis 48
governing word in a rule 83
grammatical number 114
homonym 109, 117
homonymy 118
incidental conjunctive process 45
inconsistencies in the A. 57
independent svarita 52
individval item 116
instrumental ending 123, 126
intermediary 116
internal inconsistencies 95
intonational contrast 57
laukika usage 12
less preferred option 4
lexical and grammatical meaning 114
lup-deletion 95
lup-deletion technique 93
meaning is understood from usage 94
meta-language 43
middle pitch 56
mistake in the prescribed intonation 62

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

nairuktas 77
names of grammarians 39
nominal stem 114
nominative-instrumental construction 123, 126
non-pronominal form 129
one-to-one correspondence 43
one-way conflict 2
option regarding the prohibition 39, 41
optional 36
original layer of the text of the A. 95
Pāṇini's system 110
philosophical 114
phonetics 43
pitch 49
places of articulation 49
plural of respect in connection with yuṣmad 103
point of view of reference 98
positive injunctions provided without option term 36
presumption of the ekaśeṣa-techique 108
principal and subordinate elements 98
principal-subordinate 98
principal-subordinate relation between a stem and suffix 97
procedures adopted in the taddhita-section 93
prohibitions provided with an option term 36
pronominal form 129
prosodic features 44
question of gender and number 89
redundant ca 102
register of voice 48
replacement of pitch by stress 50
replacement of pitch register tones 52
replacement of pitch relative duration 44
rules dealing with ekaśruti 55
rules dealing with Vedic data 66
rules of grammar 94, 95
rules prescribing cp-formation 73
sāmānya-principle 124
same form and the same meaning 109
same form but a different meaning 109
section dealing with cp-formation 72
saṃhitāpāṭha of Pāṇini's text 43
sequence of fully finished padas 111
sequence P. 1.2.32-40 55
sequence P. 1.2.42-44 75
shift the sequence P. 1.2.32-40 65
siddha-principle 2, 4, 9
simultaneous reference 113
singular instead of the dual 106
species 115
speech-community 98
śrautasūtra literature 55
statements contained in P. 1.2.53-57 97
stem-suffix analysis 94
substantive 91
supposition of the ekaśeṣa doctrine 114
syntactic agreement 93
syntactic agreement between guṇa-vacana words and substantives 91
syntactic elements 118
technical locative and a genitive form 112
terms used in the nominative 1
uṇādisūtras 77
underivable (avyutpanna) nominal stems 77
usage 95, 97
vedic forms 106
word-derivational procedure 114
word-group 111, 117, 129
word-group example 126
words conveying a convention non-derivable meaning 96

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji